

100TH YEAR
PERIODICAL ROOM
GENERAL LIBRARY
UNIV. OF MICH.

JANUARY, 1936

JAN 27 1936
No. 396

THE DUBLIN REVIEW

A QUARTERLY AND CRITICAL JOURNAL

This issue includes

The Holy See and War

BY REV. HUMPHREY JOHNSON

England and Italy

BY M. MANSFIELD

The Romantic Hellenist

BY ARNOLD LUNN

Abbot Chapman's Letters

BY ABBOT VONIER, O.S.B.

LONDON

BURNS OATES AND WASHBOURNE LTD.

Price 3s. 6d. or \$1 net. Yearly Subscription, 15s. or \$4 Post Free.

Registered at the Post Office, Chicago, as Second-Class Matter.

COMMUNICATIONS in regard to articles and all books for review, as well as all communications respecting the Publishing Department, should be addressed to BURNS OATES & WASHBOURNE, Ltd., 43, 44, 45 Newgate Street, London, E.C.1. Advertisements should reach the Publishers not later than the 10th of the last month of each Quarter.

No MSS. can be returned unless accompanied by stamped addressed envelopes. Articles can only be received on the understanding that publication alone is a guarantee of acceptance and payment. Articles should not be submitted without preliminary correspondence.

THE DUBLIN REVIEW is published on or about the 1st of January, April, July, and October.

THE DUBLIN REVIEW

January, February, March,
1936

LONDON
BURNS OATES AND
WASHBOURNE LTD.

NOTES ON CONTRIBUTORS

REV. HUMPHREY JOHNSON, of the Birmingham Oratory, is author of "*The Papacy and the Kingdom of Italy*".

REV. HERBERT THURSTON, S.J., one of the most learned Jesuits of his time, has published a great number of works concerning the Church's history.

MISS MILDRED MANSFIELD, daughter of a famous British Ambassador, has lived for years in Florence and published various books concerning Italy.

DON OLIVEIRA SALAZAR is Prime Minister of Portugal and leader of its Catholic Government.

GREGORY MACDONALD, a very gifted journalist, has made a special study of the economic and financial aspects of modern politics.

BRIAN MAGEE is a lecturer at the London School of Economics.

COMTESSE CLARE DE CHAMBRUN, who holds a doctorate at the Sorbonne, has published some twenty volumes of researches concerning Shakespeare and his times.

KATHARINE GARVIN is a daughter of the editor of the "*Observer*".

REV. E. C. MESSENGER, formerly a professor at St. Edmund's College, has become a leading authority on Reformation history.

MONSIGNOR ARTHUR S. BARNES is a convert from the Anglican ministry and has since been Catholic Chaplain at both Oxford and Cambridge Universities.

EGERTON CLARKE has published several volumes of distinguished verse.

ARNOLD LUNN, a recent convert from Nonconformity and a brilliant Catholic controversialist, has also published excellent books on foreign travel.

REV. VINCENT McNABB, O.P., one of the best-known Dominican scholars in the English province, has been Prior of Holy Cross and of Hawkesyard.

ABBOT VONIER has been Abbot of Buckfast since 1906 and is one of the foremost spiritual writers and theologians in England.

CONTENTS

JANUARY, FEBRUARY, MARCH,

1936

	PAGE
The Holy See and War	
By Rev. Humphrey Johnson, Cong. Orat.	1
Pope Benedict's Peace Note	14
England and Italy	
By M. Mansfield	17
Abyssinian Devotion to Our Lady	
By Rev. Herbert Thurston, S.J.	29
Economic Ideas in Portugal	
By Oliveira Salazar	43
Dwight Morrow and his Circle	
By Gregory Macdonald	53
England's Catholic Population in Penal Times—II	
By Brian Magee	66
Shakespeare Under the Elizabethan Statutes	
By Comtesse C. Longworth de Chambrun	84
Rosary Sunday (Poem)	
By Katharine Garvin	98
Bishop Bonner and Anglican Orders	
By Rev. E. C. Messenger	100
Two Great Anglican Churchmen	
By Rt. Rev. Mgr. A. S. Barnes	111
March (Poem)	
By J. MacLeod	126
Gerard Hopkins, Jesuit	
By Egerton Clarke	127
The Romantic Hellenist	
By Arnold Lunn	142
Cardinal Pole's Eirenikon	
By Rev. Vincent McNabb, O.P.	149
Abbot Chapman's Spiritual Letters	
By Rt. Rev. Abbot Vonier, O.S.B.	161
Some Recent Books — — — — —	168

FREEDOM AND THE SPIRIT, reviewed by E. I. WATKIN (p. 168); (1) FREEDOM IN THE MODERN WORLD, (2) THE FREEDOM OF THE INTELLECT AND OTHER CONVERSATIONS WITH THE SAGE THEONAS, reviewed by E. I. WATKIN (p. 172); RELIGION AND THE MODERN STATE, reviewed by E. I. WATKIN (p. 176); (1) SAINT PETER CANISIUS, S.J., (2) JOAN OF ARC, (3 and 4) DON JOHN OF AUSTRIA, reviewed by DAVID MATHEW (p. 178); PAPAL PROVISIONS, reviewed by DAVID MATHEW (p. 180); A HISTORY OF THE CHURCH, reviewed by GERVASE MATTHEW, O.P. (p. 181); THOMAS MORE, reviewed by HUGH LAW (p. 183); THE ANGLO-SAXONS, reviewed by DOUGLAS WOODRUFF (p. 185).

THE CLERGY REVIEW

is a practical, constructive magazine for the Pastoral Clergy, devoted to the reasoned exposition of doctrine and practice, neither controversial nor merely defensive. It covers all departments of sacred learning of actual interest to its readers.

DOGMATIC THEOLOGY APOLOGETICS
MORAL THEOLOGY SACRED SCRIPTURE
CANON LAW SOCIOLOGY

*The "CLERGY REVIEW" for 1936 will contain
NEW FEATURES AND SPECIAL ARTICLES*

The programme is obtainable from the address below.

EDITOR :

The Rev. T. E. FLYNN, Ph.D., M.A.

ASSISTANT EDITOR :

The Very Rev. J. M. T. BARTON, D.D., L.S.S.

Published on the first of each month.

*Annual Subscription £1 (or \$5), post free, to any part
of the world.*

**The Manager, "The CLERGY REVIEW"
184, Strand, London, W.C.2**

The Dublin Review

JANUARY, 1936

No. 396

THE HOLY SEE AND WAR

The Catholic Tradition of the Law of Nations. By John Eppstein. (Burns Oates and Washbourne. 15s.)

Must War Come? By John Eppstein. (Burns Oates and Washbourne. 3s. 6d.)

TOWARDS midday on 20 August, 1914, there were to be seen, side by side in the London streets, two posters indicating the contents of the early editions of the evening papers. One bore the words, "Germans nearing Brussels"; on its fellow was inscribed, "Death of the Pope". That same afternoon the grey-coated Uhlans stole noiselessly into the Grande Place in the Belgian Capital, so noiselessly that the crowd inside was unaware of their approach, while in Rome the preparation of the *Novemdiales*, or nine days' funeral Masses, for the deceased Pontiff began. The two events were not unconnected. Pius X had been long suffering from nephritis, and the state of his health was such that it was doubtful whether he would live another year. The outbreak of war, however, hastened the end; yet persons received in audience as late as 15 August did not realize how near it was. But on the 18th the Pope became seriously ill, and early on the 20th he died.

Within a fortnight, after one of the shortest conclaves in history, in which Cardinal Agliardi played a leading part, a new Pope—Benedict XV—was elected. Europe slowly woke up to the fact that the Papacy still existed. The barriers which, so it had been fondly hoped, would have stood between the European peoples and a general war had broken down. The close family relationship existing among the reigning houses had been of no avail. The intellectual *entente*, fostered by frequent gatherings of scholars and men of science belonging to the now warring nations, had dissolved into an unsubstantial

mist, which was soon to be replaced by acrimonious polemics too often redolent of the lowest grade of popular journalism. A factor reputed to be more formidable than either of the foregoing, the mighty forces of international socialism, had accomplished as little.

The overwhelming majority of French and German Socialists and about half the English ones were solidly behind the war, and a priest-hating workman of Paris, flinging his arms round a patriotic *abbé*, would transfer his ill-will to his former comrades beyond the Rhine. No one, of course, had supposed that the Pope could have prevented the outbreak of a European war, but vigorous pronouncement upon it was looked for by those who did not stop to reflect whether all the facts necessary for an impartial judgement were before the Sovereign Pontiff or not. Protestant England, which had rejoiced when the Pope lost his independence, and had been instrumental in preventing him from being represented at the Hague Conference, demanded, through a thousand strident voices, that he should declare her cause to be just. Benedict XV did not accede to this demand, except in so far as the liberation of Belgium and the occupied parts of France was one of the British war aims ; but his work, both diplomatic and humanitarian, throughout the four years of war is now receiving the praise of an increasing number of non-Catholic Englishmen.

The late Pope's labours on behalf of international peace, together with those of his predecessors and those of the present Holy Father, have been one of the themes of two books : *The Catholic Tradition of the Law of Nations* and *Must War Come?*, which have recently appeared from the pen of Mr. John Eppstein, a convert to Catholicism, who has been a member of the United Kingdom Delegation to the Assembly of the League of Nations. The larger of the two works, *The Catholic Tradition of the Law of Nations*, written for the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, covers a much wider field than that of Papal intervention in international disputes. The whole teaching of Catholic theologians on the subjects of peace and war, of international relations, and of the treatment of backward people from

New Testament times to our own day is set forth, and copiously illustrated by English translations of the relevant documents and extracts. In view, however, of the limited scope indicated by the title of this article, I shall confine myself to considerations of those portions of Mr. Eppstein's book which deal specifically with the action of the Holy See. The first Bishop of Rome was an internationalist: "God hath showed me to call no man common or unclean" (Acts x, 29). Yet in no age has the Holy See stood for a thorough-going pacifism. The profession of a soldier is nowhere condemned in the New Testament, and the first-century Pope, Clement of Rome, writing to the Church of Corinth, speaks of Christians as soldiers in a way which indicates that he did not regard their profession as dishonourable.*

The earliest pronouncement by a Pope on the lawfulness of war quoted by Mr. Eppstein is that of Nicholas I, writing to the newly converted Bulgarians in the ninth century. "War", he says, "is always satanic in its origin, and you must always abstain from it. But if it is impossible to avoid it—that is, in defence of oneself, of one's country, and of the laws of one's fathers—it is without doubt lawful to make ready to meet it, even during Lent.† The lawfulness of defensive war was early admitted. With regard, however, to the action of later Popes in encouraging war in the interests of religion, Catholic writers have not been at one. The nakedly offensive war, of which the campaigns of Jenghiz Khan and Timur were examples, presents no problem, as it is plainly unlawful. It is the offensive-defensive war—in which one perpetrates an act of aggression on the ground that it is the only way, or at least the most effective one, of protecting oneself—which becomes a puzzle to moralists.

"There is a school of Catholic historians", writes Mr. Eppstein, "who dispute the morality of the Crusades—or, at least, of certain of them."‡ He quotes a severe judgement of the well-known Catholic historian von Ruville: "It is certain that Christianity was never so near to Islam as when they fought most bitterly. The Pope

* *Law of Nations*, p. 31.

‡ *Must War Come?* p. 19.

† *Law of Nations*, p. 196.

behaved like the Khalifs in that he both encouraged and led those Holy Wars . . . The idea of winning Heaven through deeds of blood dominated both sides."* It is not irrelevant to recall, however, that while Islam began offensive war against Christendom at its birth, Christendom did not take the counter-offensive against Islam till the later religion had been in existence for nearly five centuries. In course of time, the leadership of the Islamic world passed from the Arab to the Turk, and as the Mohammedan tide ebbed in Spain, a new wave was engulfing Eastern Europe, eventually threatening both Germany and Italy. The Crusades, to which the Popes then called Europe, could not be described as other than wars of defence. In face of the Turkish menace, the Pope displayed an energy which often put secular sovereigns to shame. Eleven years after the fall of Constantinople, on the vigil of the Assumption in 1464, Pius II died of fever at Ancona when about to lead a Crusade to save an inert Europe from the Ottoman peril.

Piccolomini's efforts to dam back the Turkish flood were unavailing; but a century later his successor of the same name—the reforming Pope, St. Pius V—put Europe under a lasting debt by entering into that alliance with Spain and Venice, bearing fruit at Lepanto, which saved Italy from an Asiatic invasion. Throughout the seventeenth century, and even in the early part of the eighteenth, the Popes continued to subsidize the Emperor and the Serene Republic for the prosecution of the Turkish wars. Pious testators left bequests for this purpose. A clause in Mazarin's will provides for a legacy of 600,000 livres to the Holy See to finance the crusade against the Turks. During the eighteenth century, however, the Turkish problem changed. The Ottoman power declined rapidly, and Russia took the place of Austria as the champion of the Christian subjects of the Porte. In the nineteenth century, Russia became a more dreaded enemy of Catholicism than Turkey. In the Crimean War, the Turkish side even appeared to be the Catholic one, and when in 1911 certain Italian

* *Law of Nations*, p. 95.

Catholics tried to give the Tripoli campaign a religious aspect they were strongly discouraged by Pius X.

The idea of a Holy War against the enemies of the Faith found expression in the West, as well as in the East, and begins to fade away only in the seventeenth century. During the Thirty Years' War, Urban VIII, notwithstanding that he sang a *Te Deum* on the death of Gustavus Adolphus, resisted the pressure brought to bear upon him from Madrid and Vienna to invoke against Louis XIII and Richelieu the canonical penalties incurred by *fautores haeresiae*. With the Treaty of Westphalia in 1648, the principle enunciated at Augsburg ninety-three years earlier, *cujus regio, ejus religio*, is ratified, and the religious geography of Europe begins to assume its present lineaments. The Catholic world gradually shakes off the illusion that unity of faith can be restored by deeds of blood. There begins an epoch in the history of the Papacy marked by the relative withdrawal of the Popes from intervention in international affairs, which closed only with the peace note of Benedict XV in 1917. Generation by generation men's thoughts and ambitions grew more secular. The religious divisions of Europe became blurred by political alliances. On the morning of Blenheim, Austrian Capuchins, Church of England clergymen, and Dutch Calvinist ministers—whose Orders were recognized neither by Catholic nor by Anglican—offered their spiritual ministrations to the allied army. The days of Peter the Hermit were now remote indeed.

Yet there were pious souls who feared lest this comradeship in arms would lead to baneful results. During this same War of the Spanish Succession, the Fathers of the Oratory in Turin trembled lest the presence of the "allied heretics", as they called the Protestant troops in the Imperial army, would contaminate the faith of the Piedmontese capital. As the eighteenth century advanced, the political influence of the Holy See steadily declined, and Papal diplomacy becomes occupied with such matters as the tedious dispute about the duchies of Parma and Piacenza. In the middle of the century, however, there is a curious and belated revival of the idea

of a Holy War. Frederick the Great emerges as the Protestant hero in the Seven Years' War. Yet his enemies and his allies alike are oddly assorted, and the politico-religious confusion of the age is aptly illustrated by words put by Thackeray into the mouth of Barry Lyndon :

Most of the low fellows enlisted with myself were of course Papists (the English army was filled with such out of that never-failing country of ours), and these forsooth were fighting the battles of Frederick, who was belabouring the Protestant Swede, and the Protestant Saxons, as well as the Russians of the Greek Church, and the Papist troops of the Emperor and the King of France.

The Austrian Commander, Marshal Daun, after his victory over the Prussian king at Hochkirch, received from Clement XIII a blessed sword and hat and a dove of pearls. The gift moved Frederick to sarcastic mirth, and Macaulay to pompous scorn.

Once more, in the nineteenth century, the Holy War reappears, but it is for the last time. On 23 March, 1848, a vast crowd assembled in the Colosseum demanded of the Pope that he should declare a "crusade" of a new kind—not like the old ones on behalf of the Christian Faith, but on behalf of the new religion of nationalism. Pius IX could not, of course, declare war against Austria ; but, on the other hand, he could not prevent the Papal troops under General Durando from taking part in the war against her. Yet when the Revolution had forced him to leave his capital, he was faced again with a tragic dilemma. He called on the Catholic powers—France, Spain, Austria, and Naples—to restore the temporal power. The call was answered. Yet Italy's reply to Pius IX has been to set up Garibaldi's statue on the Janiculum.*

The final disappearance of the temporal power in 1870 removed the Holy See from the list of potential belligerents in Europe, but it marks a revival of the Pope's activities as mediator. The part played by the

* Fascist Italy, not to be outdone by Liberal Italy in her devotion to the memory of the "Liberator" on the conclusion of the Lateran Treaty, erected near his statue one of Anita Garibaldi.

Holy See as an arbitrator in European history is indicated in two appendices to Mr. Eppstein's *The Catholic Tradition and the Law of Nations*. The first is an extract from *L'Eglise et le Droit de Guerre* by Frederic Duval, which enumerates the known cases of Papal arbitration between the end of the eleventh and the end of the fifteenth century. Most of the States of Europe profited by the pacific activities of the Holy See during these four centuries. Monsieur Duval's last instance is the famous arbitration by which Alexander VI drew an imaginary line dividing the New World between Spain and Portugal. This was in 1493, less than a generation before the beginning of the disruption of Western Christendom. From 1100 to 1500 the position occupied by the Popes in Europe marked them out as natural arbitrators. More interesting, therefore, are the cases of Papal intervention in the interests of peace in the period following the Reformation. As a second appendix, Mr. Eppstein includes a list of these drawn from Müller's *Das Friedenswerk der Kirche in den letzten drei Jahrhunderten*. They cover the period 1598 to 1914. The first is the Treaty of Vervins, between France and Spain, brought about by the Cardinal Legate of Clement VIII, Alessandro de' Medici.* The next concerns the dispute between France and Savoy over the marquisate of Saluzzo, of which we hear so much in the life of St. Francis de Sales. It was finally settled in 1601 by the action of the Cardinal nephew Pietro Aldobrandini.

The instances of Papal arbitration in the seventeenth century are too numerous to admit of mentioning all of them. In 1630-31 Urban VIII's representatives arbitrated in the settlement of the War of the Mantuan Succession, which broke out on the death of the Cardinal Duke Vincenzo II, by which the direct line of the ducal branch of the House of Gonzaga became extinct. In the negotiations at Münster which led to the close of the 'Thirty Years' War, the Nuncio Fabio Chigi arbitrated between the Emperor and the French king, and in 1659 Chigi, who had now ascended the Papal throne as

* As, however, Clement's objective was to unite France and Spain against the Turks, too much stress should not be laid on this treaty as an instance of "pacific" action on the part of the Holy See.

Alexander VII, helped to bring about the Treaty of the Pyrenees, which left the frontier between France and Spain as it has since remained. Mazarin, however, whom the Pope, as Nuncio, had opposed at the Conference of Münster, now prevented Alexander from acting as arbitrator.

At the end of the century the Treaty of Ryswick (1697), which put an end to the War of the Grand Alliance, appointed the Holy See to arbitrate in the question of the succession in the Palatinate. Innocent XII having died, the decision was given by his successor, Clement XI, in 1702. After this Pope, whose diplomacy was unable to play an effective part during the War of the Spanish Succession and in the framing of the Treaty of Utrecht, the "Age of Enlightenment" settled down upon Europe. The belief grew, and is beginning to disappear only in our own time, that the Holy See was a survival from a state of society which humanity had outgrown. The Papacy counted for less and less in international affairs. No further cases of Papal intervention in the interests of peace among nations are given by Müller till the letters addressed by Pius IX to the Emperor of the French and the King of Prussia on 22 July, 1870.

The most important case of Papal intervention in modern times was that of Leo XIII in the dispute between Germany and Spain over the Caroline Islands in 1885. Of this arbitration Mr. Eppstein records only the bare fact. The details are, however, of sufficient interest to merit recording. The Caroline Islands, a scattered archipelago lying to the east of the Philippines, were first discovered by the Portuguese in 1527. They were renamed at the end of the seventeenth century by a Spanish admiral in honour of Charles II, the last of the Habsburg Kings of Spain. In 1885, an acute conflict broke out between Spain, who had been thought to have abandoned her claim to the islands, and Germany, who had established a factory on Yap—a member of the group. Towards the end of August the German flag was hoisted on the island by the commander of the gunboat *Itz*. A Spanish squadron, just arrived from Manila,

had been present, but the admiral in command made no protest. Bismarck had, a few days before the event, notified the Government of Alfonso XII of his intention of occupying the islands. He said that, in the event of the piercing of the isthmus of Panama, they would constitute an important link in the maritime communications between America and Eastern Asia; and that Spain had, on her own admission, abandoned her claim to them some years earlier.

Cholera was raging in Madrid and in several of the provinces, and was claiming upwards of a thousand victims a day. Notwithstanding the cholera, however, and notwithstanding the fact that the islands were of little or no value to Spain, public opinion was raised to fever heat. There is no European people so sensitive where national honour is concerned as is the people of Spain. The nation demanded that the officers and crews of the squadron which had failed to resist German aggression should be tried by court martial. A monster meeting of protest was held in the Prado. The climax was reached on 4 September, when a mob tore down the flagstaff and escutcheon of the German Legation, and dragged them to the Puerta del Sol, where they were burnt. For a few days war appeared imminent. Canovas del Castillo, the Conservative leader, was then in office. He quickly apologized to Count Solms, the German Minister. Then Bismarck astonished Europe by suggesting that Leo XIII should be asked to arbitrate. The *Kulturkampf* was in its closing stages. Diplomatic relations between Prussia and the Vatican had been resumed, and the ecclesiastical salaries, withheld while the "May Laws" were in vigour, were being repaid. This step, therefore, would help him to wind up the conflict, and would be gratifying to Catholic Spain.

The Chancellor wisely disregarded the mischief-makers, German Protestants and Liberal Catholics—who saw in his action a return to mediævalism—and Italian anticlericals, who were chagrined at the increased prestige which would accrue to the Papacy. Canovas, as head of the Conservative party, had to show the Carlists that an Alfonsist Minister could uphold the Catholic traditions

of Spain ; yet, where the national honour was concerned, could even the Holy Father himself be permitted to arbitrate ? The Government of Madrid suggested that the Pope should not "arbitrate", but should "mediate". Bismarck accepted this subtle distinction, and within a short time the Papal Secretary of State, Cardinal Jacobini, was able to telegraph to Mgr. Rampolla, the Nuncio in Madrid, that Leo XIII had accepted the office of mediator. The Pope gave his award on 22 October. He recognized Spain's claim to the main Caroline group, with free trading rights for Germany, but refused the Spanish claim to the Marshall and Gilbert Archipelagos to the east and south-east of the Carolines, as well as to the Pelew Islands between the Carolines and the Philippines.* The protocol was signed in Cardinal Jacobini's apartments at the Vatican on 17 December by the Secretary of State ; by de Molins, the Spanish Ambassador to the Vatican ; and by the Prussian Minister, Schloezer. The German Emperor sent Leo XIII a pectoral cross set with rubies and diamonds, and to Cardinal Jacobini the Order of the Black Eagle. The Pope sent the Order of Christ to Bismarck, *Excelsus vir, magnus cancellarius*. It was the first time that it had been bestowed on a Protestant.

Early in 1891 Leo XIII again acted as arbitrator ; this time between Belgium and Portugal in the matter of the boundary of the Congo Free State. Another part of the world also provided a field for his pacific influence : the penetration of civilization into the heart of the South American continent necessitated a delimitation of the frontiers of the States into which it was divided. During the last decade of the nineteenth century and the first decade of the present one, representatives of the Holy See were able to render assistance in the disputes to which this process gave rise. In 1905 Colombia and Peru reached an agreement that "all disputes, with the exception of questions of independence and honour, shall be submitted to the arbitration of the Pope, in cases where they cannot be amicably settled by direct negotiations".†

* After the Spanish-American War, Germany purchased the Caroline Islands from Spain for £800,000.

† *Law of Nations*, p. 475.

Mr. Eppstein believes that had the Holy See been allowed to participate in the Hague Conferences of 1899 and 1907, the practice of international arbitration might have been functioning with greater vitality in 1914. The story of Leo XIII's exclusion from the first Hague Conference is a particularly discreditable one. Though its meeting was due to the initiative of Nicholas II, the idea of an international peace conference had been derived by the Czar from a suggestion made by the Pope to the Russian statesman, Prince Lobanov. The Emperor was most anxious that the Sovereign Pontiff should be represented, but Italy was resolved to make mischief, and a ridiculous story that Cardinal Rampolla had slighted the Italian Foreign Minister, Admiral Canevaro, at the requiem for Félix Faure, was alleged as an excuse for her opposition. Had Italy stood alone, she might have been unable to have her way. But Britain's relations with France were strained. It was not long since Marchand's dramatic appearance at Fashoda, and there was felt to be need of Italy's goodwill. The Foreign Office, then under the direction of Mr. Balfour, during Lord Salisbury's absence on the Riviera, lent its support to the intrigue by which Leo XIII was excluded from the Conference.

Benedict XV's attempted mediation in 1917 marked the resumption by the Holy See of an active intervention in the affairs of Europe such as had been discontinued after the Counter-Reformation. So far as I am aware, the only account of it which has appeared in this country is my pamphlet *Vatican Diplomacy in the World War*.^{*} The moment chosen by the Pope for intervention was the crisis of the war, following upon the Russian Revolution.

At least a moment had arrived [writes Count de Salis in his foreword to my pamphlet] which offered some chance of success; the Russia of the outbreak of the war had collapsed; Austria-Hungary was anxious for peace with the Serbian Government, which had solved one of the difficulties by executing the officer to whom they themselves attributed responsibility for the murder

^{*} Blackwell (1933).

of the Archduke. In the forefront was the Belgian question, and there were signs in Germany that the only proper solution might be within sight.

The Pope proposed to wind up the war on the basis of a compromise, and now that both Austria and Russia were ready for peace this should have been possible.

His efforts at mediation failed. The first result of this failure was to put the Soviets into power. An early peace, on the other hand, would have given the moderate party in Russia a good chance of holding its own against the extremists. A settlement such as the Papal note provided for, by discrediting extreme nationalists on both sides, would have entrusted the post-war settlement of Europe to moderate men. No one knew better than Benedict XV that perpetual peace is unattainable in this world; but a settlement such as he advocated would, it is becoming increasingly clear, have given Europe a period of greater tranquillity than she has endured since 1918, besides saving countless lives and avoiding that destruction of wealth which has led to such dire results in the economic sphere. Catholic opinion has been, and still is, sharply divided with regard to Benedict XV's proposals, both in England and on the Continent. By the Catholics of Germany and Italy they were well received. But the extent to which nationalism has become identified with religion in France has led many French Catholics to complain that, under Benedict XV and his successor, the Vatican has become infected with the virus of "international pacifism". A peace more severe than the Treaty of Versailles, such as these Catholics desired, would indeed have disabled Germany for a longer period. Yet it would have carried in its train not merely the probability but the certainty of another war.

Pius XI has continued his predecessor's work on behalf of peace, though necessarily upon other lines, and he incurred some of Pope Benedict's unpopularity in France at the time of the occupation of the Ruhr by a letter to Cardinal Gasparri on reparations. The Holy See has had no direct relations with the League of Nations,

and indeed before the Lateran Treaty such relations would have caused uneasiness in Italy. In 1923, however, a suggestion was made to it that the establishment of diplomatic relations between the Vatican and the League Council might be mutually advantageous. Mr. Eppstein, who had transmitted the proposal, received the following reply (dated 11 August) :

. . . The project could be accepted only in the sense that the Holy See would be at the disposal of the League of Nations for matters coming within its competence ; that is to say, for the elucidation of questions of principle, and in regard to morality and public international law, and also to give help to the League's relief work, where its [the Holy See's] intervention would be of value to suffering peoples.*

The only clause of the Lateran Treaty which bears directly on the position of the Holy See, in the case of war, is Article XII, which provides that the representatives at the Vatican of States with whom Italy may be at war shall not be obliged to leave Rome on the outbreak of hostilities. In the framing of the Treaty, the Holy See was desirous to avoid, as far as possible, all risk of complications in the event of war. For this reason, the German cemetery (with regard to which the German Government claimed some rights) and, in consequence, the Palace of the Holy Office were not included within the area of the Vatican City, though the Italian Government were willing that they should be.†

I closed my pamphlet *Vatican Diplomacy in the World War* with the aspiration :

May God grant that the Holy Year proclaimed by Pius XI in 1933 may witness that turning-point for the better in the history of Europe which his predecessor so vainly strove to bring about sixteen years ago.

Did it do so ? I venture to think that the negative answer to this question is not as certainly the right one

* Quoted in *Law of Nations*, p. 320.

† The German cemetery is situated between the Palace of the Holy Office and the present boundary of the Vatican City. The Ethiopian College within the precincts of the Città del Vaticano is not of course the property of the Abyssinian Government. Most of its students are natives of Eritrea.

as would appear at first sight. When the Holy Year opened on Passion Sunday, 1933, the tension between Germany and Poland over the so-called "Corridor" was the most disquieting feature of the European situation. By the agreement of 26 January, 1934, this question was shelved for a period of ten years. Germany has even hinted that it may be renewed at the expiry of this period. The German-Polish Agreement has caused grave consternation among French nationalists and in those circles on this side of the Channel in which attempts are being made to create ill-feeling between England and Germany. Yet the alternative to this agreement might well have been a Russo-German alliance having for its object a new partition of Poland, and a general war long before 1944, in which France could have rendered but little assistance to her Polish ally, hemmed in between two giants.

The Roman Jubilee of 1933-34 was, as is customary, extended the following year to the whole world. During this period, Europe safely circumnavigated the dangerous promontory of the Saar Plebiscite. The elimination of two grave sources of peril, one in Western and one in Eastern Europe, during the period chosen by Pius XI for the celebration of the nineteenth centenary of our Redemption should prevent us from regarding the future as without hope.

HUMPHREY JOHNSON, CONG. ORAT.

THE PEACE NOTE OF BENEDICT XV

[The following letters exchanged between the Foreign Office and the Archbishop of Westminster concerning His Grace's article in the July issue of THE DUBLIN REVIEW were received too late for inclusion in the October issue.]

FOREIGN OFFICE, S.W.I.
23rd September, 1935.

MOST REVEREND SIR,

I am directed by Secretary Sir Samuel Hoare to state that his attention has been called to a footnote (on page 8)

to your article "The Jubilee of King George V" in the issue of the *Dublin Review* for July, 1935, which is as follows :

"I prefer not to dilate here on the attitude of the Government towards Benedict XV's Peace Note of 1917. But I may say that Cardinal Gasparri, Secretary of State to His Holiness, authorized me to write to Lord Braye to confirm his lordship's statement that the note was never even acknowledged."

2. This footnote seriously misrepresents the action of His Majesty's Government at the time. The Peace Note was forwarded from Rome to the Secretary of State on the 9th August, 1917, by Count John de Salis, then His Majesty's Minister to the Holy See, together with extra copies of it for the Heads of Allied States with whom the Holy See was not in diplomatic relations.

3. On 16th August, Count de Salis was instructed by telegraph to inform the Cardinal Secretary of State that His Majesty the King had gladly complied with the wishes of His Holiness, and had at once transmitted the copies as desired. He was further instructed to add that "His Majesty the King has received these proposals with the most sincere appreciation of the lofty and benevolent intentions which have animated His Holiness, and that His Majesty's Government will study them with the closest and most serious attention."

4. On the 18th August Count de Salis reported that he had taken an early opportunity of communicating to Cardinal Gasparri the message contained in this telegram, and that "the Cardinal expressed his warm thanks for the communication, and it was evident that he was pleased by it."

5. It would appear therefore that, after the lapse of some years, the circumstances attending the reception and acknowledgement of the Peace Note were no longer remembered by His Eminence : but at the same time the footnote to Your Lordship's article casts a serious reflection on the courtesy of His Majesty's Government, and I am to express the hope of the Secretary of State

that you will give as much publicity to the facts of the case as the original article and footnote obtained.

I am, Most Reverend Sir,

Your obedient servant,

The Most Reverend

STEPHEN GASELEE.

The Archbishop of Westminster.

September 28, 1935.

SIR,

I very much regret that a footnote to my article in the issue of the *Dublin Review* for July, 1935, has caused serious misapprehension about the action of His Majesty's Government in regard to the Peace Note of Benedict XV of August 9, 1917.

There can be no question that I was commissioned by the late Cardinal Gasparri to write to the late Lord Braye to the effect that the Note had never been acknowledged by His Majesty's Government. But in view of the information conveyed to me in your letter of 23rd inst. I at once withdraw any actual or unintentional, if seemingly implied, reflection on the courtesy of His Majesty's Government, and I sincerely thank you for the information.

As regards publication, I propose having your letter and my reply published in full in the Catholic papers and in the next possible issue of the *Dublin Review*.

I am at a loss to know how this regrettable misunderstanding arose. It occurs to me as possible that the communication to the late Cardinal Secretary of State of His Holiness was made verbally and not in writing; in which case it would appear, as suggested in your letter, that the circumstances attending the reception and acknowledgement of the Peace Note were imperfectly remembered by His Eminence after the lapse of some years and in the distracting conditions of the times.

I am, Sir,

Your faithful servant,

✠ ARTHUR,

ARCHBISHOP OF WESTMINSTER.

The Under-Secretary of State,

Foreign Office, S.W.1.

ENGLAND AND ITALY

IF the fact of anti-English sentiment in Italy is incontrovertible today, and its immediate cause be not less obvious, the more remote origin of this feature—indeed, to students of human character, its somewhat contradictory expression—appears of sufficient interest to warrant a retrospect in which certain among today's germs may be discerned. The apparent ease with which a century-old friendship has been demolished puzzles a category of English opinion which, albeit only a second- or even third-hand witness to a past generation's attitude, yet cherishes the memory of England's welcome to the Young Italy movement, tending to the political constitution of the nation which, from the fall of the Western Empire onward, had preserved her Roman soul alive. Her spirit undaunted, Young Italy had fought the good fight upon the ruins of Napoleon's phantom kingdom. Vanquished for a while, their prophet and seer Giuseppe Mazzini found, in England, understanding, the prerequisite of success. And another perplexed group remains still with us, the ever dwindling company of Victorians who recall the triumph prepared in 1864 for Giuseppe Garibaldi, the spiritual symbol of Italian nationhood regained, and watch the cloud—yesterday no bigger than a man's hand—gather today enough to darken the whole sky, indeed to redden the morrow. Both these groups stand amazed, sorrowing rather than angered, asking themselves: Whence this rift? Whither will it lead? Where does the gravamen lie—and with whom?

The clue, I believe, must be sought in a human reading of history; the records of experience rarely, if ever, read aright. The nineteenth century had set up a fourth centennial milestone upon the road connecting Italian thought with England. The road had indeed been trodden by many feet before Elizabethan days, which showed conditions similar under certain aspects to the aftermath of the Napoleonic failure to separate the good from the evil, which resulted from revolution in France. Then, as the nineteenth century was to see, Italians brought their language to willing pupils. Speculative minds brought

their learning ; astronomers, physicians in advance of the knowledge of the day were welcome in academic circles of Oxford and London—although the theories they propounded, particularly Giordano Bruno's, incurred the destiny ever dealt out to the forerunner. And in the category of prophets and seers akin to Mazzini were there not the Italian Reformers—clerks in holy orders to a man, from the heterodox prelate to the mere friar, whose tenets had laid them open to the sanctions of Canon Law and ecclesiastical discipline ? To them English hospitality would not be denied. And conversely, Englishmen were familiar wayfarers upon the road to Italy : scholars and poets, courtiers and cultured gentlemen errant, all drawn to the path of the sun, made Italy their Mecca. These pilgrims were guests at princely tables, assiduous visitants at universities where several—"the admirable Crichton" among them—left their mark. In Rome, even, Protestantism notwithstanding, none would consider himself alien.

The Revolution, the Napoleonic Wars, and Continental blockade failed to arrest the intellectual flow both ways. Whilst poets over half the century, from Byron to Browning, sang the praise of Italy in that land of their spiritual adoption, those early decades of the nineteenth century saw England's provinces and London open hearts, hands, and homes to the Italian refugee. These included artists and men of letters, scholars and noblemen distinguished in their country's service in every calling and walk of life. They were welcome. Those men had left their native land behind, driven forth as outcasts—outlaws not a few with a price set upon their heads—by the autocracies which returned from exile and, finding a new spirit quickening their houses, showed in their treatment of those men that they had learned nothing and unlearned naught in the school of life. The refugees found a haven in England. Ugo Foscolo, their poet, won influence more far-reaching than he knew with his pupils' parents, whose names stood for more than mere benevolent patronage. Escape from prison for some, a timely departure for others, had left most of them destitute of all but the faith that was in

them to create Italy in the flesh even as she had ever lived in the spirit. And so it befell. They found sympathy in England: the means to shape their lives for the task that lay before them; to sustain their hopes and, for most, life itself.

Yet it was not only a new Italy that they sought to build, but rather to attack and fill by spadework the breach which political vicissitudes and a succession of alien rulers had opened in the heritage of Imperial Rome. Italy would rise from the ashes of "Romanity". If nationhood at the heart of the Western Empire was in abeyance, indeed derelict through desertion by her Emperors, the earnest of days to come through the legacy of a mighty past remained in the trusteeship of the Papacy, guardian of nations. After a safe passage through the *selva oscura* of fear in the first millenium of Christendom had been accomplished, miniature self-governing communities dotted the Peninsula—all founded upon Roman citizenship. Independent bodies, they were united in the communion of two languages: Latin, the idiom of the liturgy and tongue of the learned; and the vernacular language of the people which, in the hands of Italian poets—seers, the ancients termed them—laid the foundations of Italian nationhood upon indestructible foundations. The fourteenth century, meanwhile, saw its renascence in the spirit of Dante and Petrarch, who had set their ideal Italy in the forefront of their poetic vision. They pleaded—albeit vainly—for peace, for union under one spiritual head; material unity was to ensue through that very fact. The heart spoke through poets, the hand wielded the pen, as Italy stood in the van of European intellect. Both invoked spiritual leadership; and when, under stress of events, response fell short of hopes, the frailty of human judgement laid the fault wrongly at one door. Thus the heritage of which Western thought regarded herself as the trustee was called in question. In the East, Hellenistic philosophy had permeated the near-Asiatic and North African countries, and, mingled with Judaic speculation, had proved a new menace to the primacy of Rome and the West.

Latinity invoked the Fathers, particularly St. Augustine ; scholarship swore by Cicero ; and, fighting under the banner of Plato, the school of Humanism rose up in arms against denial of all but a material First Cause, active in the structure of Creation, which was taught by Hellenistic Arab philosophy in the name of Aristotle and Averroes. Antagonism between East and West, in that field of which the Crusades and the Latin subversion of the Eastern Empire in the first years of the thirteenth century were but symbols, was fed moreover by the sight of a crumbling secular power and an immobile Church ; whilst their Latinity had made a stand against encroachment upon the liberties of the Italian Peninsula and the attempt of alien emperors to curtail the power of the Papacy, the spiritual guardian of those liberties. The genius of St. Thomas Aquinas had laid down a happy middle course for both inductive and deductive reasoning. His teaching might have prevailed to heal the breach if the agreement reached by theology in the reunion which was sought at the Council of Florence (1438) had not failed signally in the political field. Separation was now complete between Latinity and the East. The fall of Constantinople brought a mass of Greek refugees into Italy, and the doors were opened to speculation which inevitably injected the germ of heterodoxy into a relaxed religious organism. The process through three-quarters of a century culminated with the Italian Reformers, to the detriment of Italy's nationhood. The event was sensed imperfectly only in the presence of invaders—French, Spaniards, Imperial forces. Pope Julius II (1503–13), aware only of visible danger to nationhood, had cried, "Out with the barbarians !" But the Pope failed where St. Joan of Arc, in laying down her life, won the soul of France and called that nation into life out of the welter of disunion.

Henceforward, if the Peninsula remained inert outwardly, the spirit of Italy burned brightly in the charge of her thinkers. It was unscathed, thanks to her saints, by the wars of religion burning outside, though the fires might be fed by her own sons. The explosion of "Italianità", pent up and driven underground from the

sixteenth to the closing years of the eighteenth century, amazed European thought, as the armies of the French Revolution led by their young General Bonaparte swept over Italy in 1798, carrying all before them in the name of national freedom. The creation of an Italic kingdom, temporarily ruled by a viceroy in anticipation of the next step—a vassal State with its capital in Rome—had fired a generation born into times of change. Young Italy had risen among sleepers. The vision stood for truth. Italy a playground, Italy a garden, Italy a museum, was felt to be scarce less insulting than the gibe at Italy as “a geographical expression”.

What was to be the reaction of English thought and sentiment to the picture outlined above? Political England had held the French Revolution in abhorrence. Her statesmen had checked the progress of Napoleon's Empire; her armies, in concert with Europe, had pronounced the life-sentence of exile upon the man who, under more than one aspect, had but come ahead of his time. But at bottom the driving-force in Napoleon was not alien to England's philosophy. The recession of the tide had revealed the existence of peoples in whose soul the right to national self-determination had been born. Were the hopes of Greece, of Italy, and other peoples to be frustrated through indifference? Protestant England glanced backward to the wars of religion, pregnant—though the age knew it not—with the germ of nations. The march of the Italian Reformers—into a self-governing Switzerland; into Germany, a house divided against itself, and denying the Spirit by the ordinance gone forth that the King's belief shall be his subject's religion; into the Low Countries, in arms against Spain, foremost among Catholic powers—supplied the answer. The ferment of Italian thought had leavened Protestant England of the nineteenth century. Was it a matter for surprise then that tradition, rooted in the past and crowned with military achievement over Spain, should take tangible form towards the movement in Italy whose leaders bore names about to become household words in Victorian England?

Giuseppe Mazzini and Garibaldi—the thinker and the

soldier—were born within the boundaries of the ancient Republic of Genoa, one of the four great seafaring and trading States who had carried the name of Italy far beyond Mediterranean shores; a less, indeed, but contributory, factor in England's welcome. Born at Genoa in 1805, Mazzini landed in England in 1837, the year of Queen Victoria's accession. Revolutionary journalism had fashioned his pen, which not less than his word served a magnetic personality compact of sincerity, singleness of mind and purpose, and utter contempt of personal danger. Faith in the strength of his convictions and the driving-force of his eloquence spread like wildfire. Mazzini's mentality was, moreover, attuned to England's Radicalism. His religion was an undefined Theism—non-institutional Christianity as the modern term would have it—elastic enough to satisfy the spiritual questionings of Low and Broad Churchmanship and the varied forms of Nonconformity, with the doctrine of the Church of England by law established. He found support for his work mostly among the latter, drawn as they were to the scientific agnosticism of England's utilitarians, which brought their class up against an aristocracy whom they chose to identify with Mazzini's arch-enemies, autocracy and theocracy.

Garibaldi the soldier made a not less powerful appeal to England's imagination. Much travelled, the hardships of an adventurous career, military experience, and laurels gathered overseas would be romance enough; but compassion also went out to the hunted man, in company of a devoted helpmate with a price put upon their heads by the Austrian commanders, cast both in the heroic mould. Anticipation was tense when Mazzini and Garibaldi, alone among responsible spirits of the Young Italy movement, had stood in 1848 for a new order founded upon romantic reminiscence of a vanished past. The struggle of mediæval Italy for self-government spelt freedom only in name for the masses, inasmuch as the classes constituted oligarchies that knew liberty only in personal terms. But legend had woven a glittering fabric round Cola di Rienzi's Roman Republic, which was to embrace the Peninsula and destroy a

temporal Papacy. Mazzini, the founder of the new Republican State, and Garibaldi, its soldier, failed; but their attempt was accounted to them more fruitful than many more striking actions on the battlefield. The pedestal was raised to both by Protestant England—to the soldier whose battle-cry was "*Roma o Morte!*" and to the thinker to whom the Papacy, alike as a temporal and a spiritual force, was anathema.

The term Protestant has been used here not unadvisedly. Orthodox in Catholic faith, the Young Italy movement—associated through Mazzini's action with the corresponding nationalist Young Europe movement abroad—stood for political subversion of the allegiance paid to the Holy See by the vast majority of the Italian people. Anti-Catholicism was felt in the background of the Liberal movement, to which Pope Pius IX had given his blessing, limiting his approval to action outside the Pontifical State. The profound distinction of Cavour's postulate of a Free Church within a free (Italian) State—too subtle perhaps for comprehension by a century to whom history will impute the literalness which kills the spirit—was set aside through the author's premature decease. Its sources included England. Moulded by Cavour's genius, from the Crimean War onward, the future kingdom of Italy had joined the company of great European Powers. The issue had been carried into the field of practical politics alike through the pressure of French military strength and England's diplomatic support. When, in September of that year, as the immediate result of the Franco-German War, the proclamation of the capital in Rome ensued, the event was hailed by English opinion with the religious zealot's fervour, whilst extreme Mazzinians and Garibaldians in Italy, imbued with blind aversion, were vocal in their anti-Papal expletives. Religious sectarianism and political extremism within and outside Italy worked along parallel, and indeed converging, lines towards the consummation they had striven for since French revolutionary times—namely the subversion of spiritual forces by material strength.

Not only the proclamation of Rome as the capital of

Italy but the Law of Guarantees set up the figment of respect for the person of the Pope beside the denial of his sovereign rights. The interpretation of that instrument ignored its ethical aspect, and produced the inevitable reaction in the long run upon Italian thought. None in England gave this its full weight, and here, I would submit, lies one of the germs responsible for the decay in the tradition of indestructible Italo-English friendship. Nor did any reckon with the effect of Nature's course upon the estimate of past values by generations who are no longer confronted or influenced by even second-hand testimony. The nineteenth century's closing years had seen all the makers of Italy, and almost all the witnesses for prosecution or defence in Italy, pass away. Among fellow workers in England, the poets were mute; among statesmen only Mr. Gladstone survived, whilst his name among the militants for united Italy evoked but a faint response with younger people. Opinion, moreover, in England had long left sectarian militancy behind, outworn, void of constructive force. Yet if England's feeling towards Italy, now unqualified, was satisfied to welcome Italy's place and makeweight in the concert of Europe, satisfied to admire Italy's achievement, was it to be reciprocal always? Upon England's side sincerity was absolute. The two peoples were travelling, it was thought, along the same road. Parliamentary government in Italy followed the century-old track of England, engaged on the task which has baffled mankind throughout the ages—namely, how to pour new wine into old bottles, spilling little of the contents and bursting none irremediably.

Belief in the permanence of friendship's ties between peoples whose material interests appeared mostly parallel, and seemed to conflict at no conceivable point, was furthered also by the prevailing sense of a reciprocal understanding which was manifest in the trend of Italian foreign policy throughout the last quarter of the nineteenth century. No fundamental divergence appeared in the conciliatory approach of opinion in both countries towards an equitable solution of the problems raised by minorities, in the field of social justice among

peoples in whose behalf Pope Leo XIII—the Pontiff and greatest spiritual law-giver of the age—had raised his voice. The new Italy, however, was confronted with another problem. Marco Minghetti, wisest among her makers, had said, "We have made Italy; it behoves us now to make Italians." Two ways lay open to Italy's statesmen in 1870. One was to seek the restoration of peace to the national conscience, disturbed through the violence done to spiritual authority throughout the land. The avoidance of action inspired by force against persons whose defenceless character had entitled them to protection, and whose cloth invested them with the intangible attributes of moral authority, was a prerequisite to the making of Italians in a politically united Italy. But the other road taken—the coercion of liberty of conscience—was not only alien to the Italian nature, nurtured in the ancient faith and in reverence towards her Pastor, but proved positively harmful.

The short cut to moral maturity in a nation, leaving the life of its soul out of account, deprived normal growth of the steady influence of spiritual authority. The secular power was uncertain in its incidence, at times contradictory of its avowed purpose. Moral direction was lacking in a measure sufficient to lead some of the best Conservative elements to throw up the sponge. The exponents of direct anticlericalism received a free rein for their activities. The result, scarcely realized by Liberal thought, was an unexpected impetus given to the bracketing of Liberalism in Italy with subversive forces beyond her borders. The victory won by Pope Leo XIII over the forces of State materialism in Germany may be regarded as the herald of a new stage along the road of Italy's moral growth. He had pointed the way to recognition by Italian thought of the need of spiritual guidance. Spadework was undertaken in the course of which Italian Liberalism, which had long fallen short of the principle that justified its existence—namely, to discipline citizenship through its brilliant idealism—discredited the constructive principles of parliamentary government for which England stood as the exemplar.

The close of the pontificate, coinciding with the end of Queen Victoria's long reign, was signalized in England by a reorientation of foreign policy, and in Italy by a change of heart at home deep enough to cool certain among her friendships. The louder the indestructibility of her alliance with Germany and Austria was proclaimed at each renewal of the pact, the more generally was its fundamental weakness discerned by even the least clear-sighted among readers of political weather-charts. In distant China the lease of a port failed to establish a sphere of influence similar to those of allied and friendly powers; in Egypt and the Sudan campaigns her own Government, insufficiently supported by home opinion, had waived the occasion for useful action conjointly with England; whilst her foothold on the African shore of the Red Sea and a subsequent settlement and expansion inland, bordering upon British and French possessions of longer standing, were viewed at least by France with imperfect sympathy towards an Italy associated with Germany and Austria. Italian opinion became thus keenly alive to the patronizing attitude which she sensed among her allies and vaguely suspected in England's attitude. It was recalled furthermore how Liberalism in England had been the parent of Italian parliamentary government, and England was Protestant. Now Italian Liberalism had, with the march of the years, become almost indistinguishable from Marxian Socialism: a creed that demanded at the least agnosticism from its adherents, adepts of Continental freemasonry, which places militant anticlericalism in the forefront of its political programme. And Italy, no longer anticlerical at heart in the latter years of Pope Leo XIII, was Catholic throughout the reign of Pope Pius X (1903-14). The gibe often heard during the Great War that Catholic Italy had allied herself with a heretic England, an atheist France, and a schismatic Russia gained a certain hold upon popular Catholic sentiment when the terms of the London Agreement (1915), which had been kept secret through the war, were divulged by Bolshevik Russia. Opinion learned then also that Italian statesmen had subscribed to the exclusion of the Pope from the eventual

peace negotiations. Whether the intervention of the Holy See would have availed to introduce the atmosphere of moral equity and historic justice into proceedings where hate and revenge were foremost may, alas, be questioned. But the exclusion *a priori* by Italy and her co-signatories of an advocate whose voice would only have been raised in behalf of charity and justice was felt as a *diminutio capitis* at the time. It may indeed be argued, in the light of subsequent happenings, that his exclusion contributed towards the frustration of Italy's anticipations, a sense that bred the embitterment which has burst forth today in enmity against all brothers in arms of the remote and recent past.

The slogan "Geneva rises once more against Rome" has without doubt found an echo, among those who seek analogies with the action of the Italian Reformers, in establishing a centre for their work of disruption at Geneva. No historic nexus of course exists between the choice of Geneva for seat of the League of Nations and the Church; or the Covenant to which they subscribed, including Italy, and Protestantism. But the phrase has proved sufficiently picturesque to be adopted as a watchword, in the Order to which fourteen years of Dictatorship has accustomed Italy. The Order that claims to derive its essence solely from the universal Empire of Rome close upon two thousand years ago, and to leave out of reckoning all that has happened in the interval—the decline and fall alike of the Latin and the Byzantine Christian Empire, the invasion of both by Islam, and the shifting of the axis of power westward through the discovery of America—set problems for modern Italy wherein dictatorship has chosen to discern antagonism enforcing combat. Signor Mussolini's slogan, "With Geneva, without Geneva, or against Geneva", possesses, beside its general application, a particular significance for England, who is alleged to be the prime mover and the mainspring of the Covenant. This should be understood only in a limited sense in so far as the Commonwealth of Nations, centred in the British Crown, is actually a limited experiment of the Order which the Covenant of the League of Nations seeks to

realize. Italy's greatness, the tradition of empire and the seat within her territory of the sovereign spiritual power of Christendom, forbids dissociation from the nations of Europe and overseas who are groping through the mists of post-war disillusionment towards a truer conception of human relationships.

Professor Guglielmo Ferrero, whose distinction in the world of impartial history lends special weight and authority to his observations, points out that

Italy's abiding place has ever been in the heart of the Order of Europe, which in turn has ever found her presence indispensable. The European Order [he observes] circles Italy from all sides, her make-weight is decisive, permanent throughout, in the field of literary culture and science, of politics and national economy. Europe on the other hand can never regain her poise or achieve equilibrium or find peace confronted by a discontented, anxious Italy, economically distressed and living in a state of moral and intellectual revolt against Europe. It is a crowning misfortune that, step by step and justifying her action through a diversity of pleadings, Italy should have actually proclaimed her secession from the commonwealth of Europe, to the bitter loss of the latter. Italy thus has chosen to turn away from the new Order of Europe, denying the principle of joint action which should prove the efficient driving force to bring home to all those ideals for which the new Order in Europe stands.

Professor Ferrero's clear insight traces the cause of the calamity which has befallen Europe to the fountain-head: rejection of the team spirit. The sanctions of Geneva are not penalties in the narrow sense, for Geneva is no law court before which the accused is arraigned. They are, rather, a monition to all members of the League that it behoves them to avoid the paths of lonely souls leading to despair. The appeal is made to Italy's own greatness, to reconsider her action in its unsocial aspects, and to bring her legitimate claims into harmony with the common weal. National patriotism is the common privilege of civilized communities, but it will be a sorry day for all when legitimate pride degenerates into hate—the worst counsellor of old and tried friendship.

M. MANSFIELD.

ABYSSINIAN DEVOTION TO OUR LADY

THE outbreak of hostilities between Italy and Abyssinia has filled the world with alarm. For the most part Italy is blamed because she is the aggressor, but on the other hand there is perhaps a tendency in some quarters to withhold sympathy from the Abyssinians as a people outside the pale of civilization. They are, of course, a dark-skinned race, and even if it has been maintained that the very name Abyssinia (from the Arabic *babesh*, mixture or mixed) embodies the idea of a mingling of Semitic and negroid blood, their manners are not altogether prepossessing. It can hardly be disputed that turbulence and cruelty seem to be endemic in their native haunts, the mountainous regions which cradle the Blue Nile. Still, however much of barbarism may survive in this far-off land, the subjects of the Negus stand alone among the indigenous races of Africa in the fact that they profess Christianity, and have for over a thousand years successfully held out against the tide of Mohammedanism which has surged around them. We must admit that they are Monophysites, that their sacraments—even the administration of Baptism itself—are of more than doubtful validity, and that on many occasions the Catholic missionaries who have come among them to preach submission to the Holy See have been violently assailed, imprisoned, and in some cases put to death. But in spite of social and political conditions, which remind us of the Merovingian Christianity of the sixth century, there does seem to be a deep underlying sense of religion among the Abyssinians, even though superstitious accretions have overlaid it to an extent which to the inhabitants of more civilized realms must appear well-nigh incredible.

Owing to the British campaign of 1868, which ended in the capture of Magdala and the suicide of the Negus (the so-called Emperor) Theodore,* a renewed interest began to be taken in Ethiopic literature and a good many Ethiopic manuscripts were at that time brought

* Theodore had imprisoned Captain Cameron, the British Consul, and other British officials. As he refused to release them or to offer any satisfaction, a military expedition was sent out to Abyssinia which stormed Magdala.

to England. One of these, which formed part of the library which Theodore had collected at Magdala, is, from its size and from its garishly coloured full-page illustrations, of quite exceptional interest. It came with other similar treasures into the possession of Sir Henry Meux; and his widow, taking the advice of Sir E. Wallis Budge, then Keeper of Egyptian Antiquities at the British Museum, financed the publication of this and three or four other manuscripts in a most sumptuous form. The big illustrations, more than a hundred in number, were reproduced in a coloured facsimile the size of the originals, the Ethiopic text was set up by a firm of oriental publishers at Leipzig, and a translation with a copious introduction and comments was furnished by Dr. Budge, who acted as editor.

The book to which I am referring, printed (to do justice to the illustrations) on one side only of its thick glazed paper, is so heavy that one has a difficulty in lifting it, and it is not surprising that the edition was limited to three hundred copies, "printed for private circulation". It is from this rare work, a gift from the late Sir Charles Russell, Bart., who was a friend of Lady Meux, that I have derived most of the specimens of Abyssinian devotion or credulity which are presented in this article.

When the Jesuit missionaries in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries penetrated into Abyssinia, they reported that the natives to whom they preached were greatly surprised to find them paying so much honour to Mary the Mother of God. The Ethiopian clergy were apparently under the impression that only the Copts and they themselves had remained faithful to the pure traditions of Christian belief, and in particular that they were the only people who exhibited becoming devotion to her whom they styled "the two-fold Virgin".*

* This is a rather puzzling phrase, but it recurs again and again. Sir E. Wallis Budge says that "it is nowhere explained", but adds: "It may be that the Ethiopians attributed to Mary a two-fold nature, one human and one divine, and that they in consequence attributed to her a two-fold virginity; or again the appellation may refer to her own virginity and that of her mother (St. Anne), who conceived her immaculately."—*Miracles*, p. xlii. Mr. Herbert Weld Blundell in his *Chronicle of Abyssinia*, p. 225, translates the phrase as "Virgin in two kinds, body and spirit". To me it seems simplest to regard it as embodying the familiar idea *ante et post partum Virgo*.

Thus we find the Jesuit Patriarch Mendez, in his description of the missionaries' procedure, recording how on Sunday mornings the Fathers, after a long catechetical instruction, commonly added some pious story in praise of Our Lady or her miracles, "both because the people", he says, "are everywhere enthusiastic in paying her honour, and also because the monks, in order to bring us into bad odour, maliciously put it about among the ignorant layfolk that we are the bitter enemies of any such devotion".*

Similarly Father de Azevedo, when sending in 1607 a long report to his Provincial at Goa, describes the sensation caused by the picture of the Blessed Virgin exhibited in the missionaries' church. It would seem that—apart, possibly, from one or two of the more famous monasteries—the paintings by native artists were rare and of the rudest kind. He tells us quite seriously that their own European picture was hardly ever shown without a number of people bowing down before it with sighs and tears. The Fathers took it with them sometimes on their missionary excursions, and they were continually being importuned to stop and exhibit it as they made their way from one place to another. Again we learn from him that the natives clamoured for rosaries (*contas pera rezar*); if there had been thousands to give away they would not have sufficed to meet the demand. As it was, a substitute had to be found in the shape of thongs of leather in which knots were tied.†

We might hesitate to accept this testimony, as coming from those who were anxious to give a good impression of the hopes to be formed of this new field of labour, were it not that native sources supply abundant confirmation, some of it of much earlier date than the seventeenth century. Manuscripts written in Ethiopic are not too common, but a large proportion of those which have been secured for the great European libraries are nothing more nor less than collections of the Miracles of our Lady, the counterpart of the Western *Marien-*

* See Mendez's narrative in *Rerum Aethiopicarum Scriptores Occidentales Inediti* (Ed. Beccari), Vol. VIII, p. 206.

† Beccari, *Rerum Aethiopicarum Scriptores Occidentales Inediti*, Vol. XI, pp. 106–109.

legenden of which Dr. Mussafia has written so copiously. There are as many as twenty such codices preserved among the Oriental Manuscripts at the British Museum, and the curious thing is that, among these specimens of Ethiopic script written near the sources of the Nile, we find many of the stories which have been familiar in France, Spain, and England since the twelfth century and earlier. As to the European origin of many, if not most, of them, there can be no possible doubt. It is suggested that in Spain they must have been copied by Moslem scribes in Arabic and passing thence to Africa became known to the Copts in Egypt, from whom in turn they were appropriated by the monks of Abyssinia. One of the best known of these Western tales is that of St. Ildephonsus, Archbishop of Toledo, who died in 667. Legend relates that Our Lady, in recompense for his devotion to her, presented him with a mass-vestment and sat in his episcopal chair, while terrible chastisements befell those who without authorization made use of either the chasuble or the throne. The story is certainly not of contemporary date, but it is probably earlier than the eleventh century. In any case, we find the same incidents recorded in Ethiopia of a certain Bishop Dexius, to whom is attributed the authorship of this collection of miracles.

At the beginning of the book we find a section headed :
THE COVENANT OF CHRIST WITH THE BLESSED VIRGIN MARY, which opens as follows :

One day our Lord Jesus Christ said unto Mary, "What sorrow can be greater than that which came upon thee for My sake ?" And our Lady Mary said unto Him, "O my Lord and God, there were five sorrows* which came upon me for Thy sake, and they had exceeding great power over me. The first of them was the sorrow which I endured when Simeon prophesied concerning Thee in the Temple, how that the Jews would slay Thee. The second sorrow which I endured was when I missed Thee in the

* It has been pointed out by Père Delehaye (*Analecta Bollandiana*, Vol. XII, pp. 333-352) and by others, that the reckoning of Our Lady's sorrows as seven in number is a later development. Earlier in the Middle Ages only five joys and five sorrows were honoured. See the new edition of Butler's *Lives of the Saints*, September volume, pp. 174-176 (Burns Oates and Washbourne).

Temple and I was seeking Thee for three days. The third sorrow which I endured was when I remembered how they bound Thee hand and foot and how the men of Pilate scourged Thy back. The fourth sorrow which I endured was when they crucified Thee between two thieves on the day of the eve of the Sabbath, and Thou wert naked and they drove five nails through Thy body. And the fifth sorrow which I endured was when I remembered how Joseph and Nicodemus took Thee down from the Cross and swathed Thee in fine linen and laid Thee in the tomb." And our Lord said unto her who had given Him birth: "Thus saith our Father who is in heaven: Whosoever shall keep in remembrance the sorrows and sufferings which have come upon thee for My sake and the salutation of Gabriel, I will remit to him his sins. And whosoever shall give an offering for thy name's sake, I will remit to him his sins and I will make him to inherit the kingdom of heaven. And I will come to him with thee, O thou who didst give Me birth, and I will appear to him three days before his death." This was the covenant He made with His mother, and He told it unto Dexius who wrote it down together with her miracles, so that all believers might read it. May her prayers and blessing be with us for ever and ever. Amen.

There is something here which reminds us strongly of the type of promise which we find recorded in the exhortations and writings of Alan de Rupe towards the close of the fifteenth century; but it would seem that the Ethiopic counterpart must be somewhat earlier in date.

It may in fact be confessed that there is also a good deal of extravagance in the similar literature which circulated in Europe during the later Middle Ages. The Dominican John Herolt, who died in 1468, in one of the stories of his *Promptuarium* represents Our Lord Jesus Christ as making the following promise to His Blessed Mother:

Whoever in respect to thy first sorrow shall salute Me with one Pater and one Ave, I will give him a knowledge of his sins and contrition for them. If for thy second sorrow he does the same, I will bestow on him the forgiveness of all his sins. If he repeats this again for the third, I will give him the virtues he lost by sin; if for the fourth, I will endow him with the gift of grace and I will nourish him with My own Body before his death;

and in return for the fifth I will appear to him in the moment of death and I will receive him into eternal life.*

It would almost seem that in Abyssinia these stories of Our Lady's miracles came to play a part analogous to the lessons which with us are recited in the course of the divine office. We are told for example of a certain "Book of Rules" which came from the Coptic Patriarch at Cairo, and in which it is enjoined that these miracles should be read aloud in all churches on every Sunday and every festival of the Blessed Virgin "with great honour and gladness, for Mary is honourable and beneath God Almighty there is no one more worthy of veneration". The priests who neglect to do this are anathematized, and it is declared that "they shall be excommunicated and cut off by the swords of Peter and Paul and by the sword of the words of Abba Michael", etc.

No doubt many of the stories are harmless enough, and there is a charm in their simple credulity which will make its appeal to learned and unlearned alike. For example the following :

There was a certain God-fearing man who loved our holy Lady, the two-fold Virgin Mary, and his country was Dabra; and he was married to a woman by whom he had three children, two boys and one girl. Now the girl was young and she was called Mary. And the mother of the children died and they mourned for her. And it came to pass on a day which was the festival of the glorious Nativity that they wished to go to the church; and they left the little girl in the house and fastened the door upon her so that she might not go out, for it was night.† But she wept and cried out saying: "Take me with you, and let me participate in the offering up of the Offering"; but they refused to take her and went on their way. Then she went to the image of our holy Lady, the two-fold Virgin Mary, and she cried out with tears, saying, "O my Lady, have compassion upon me and give me comfort." And straightway our holy Lady, the Virgin Mary,

* See Herolt's *Promptuarium* in the edition of Augsburg (1728), p. 860.

† This seems to point to something corresponding to our Christmas midnight Mass. The mention further on of "our Saviour's birthday" makes it clear that the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin is not here in question. But the Abyssinians do keep the feast of Our Lady's Nativity as well as all her other greater feasts. Over and above this a monthly festival is observed in her honour, as appears clearly in Budge's *Ethiopic Synaxarium*. The 21st of the month is the day selected.

who maketh to rejoice and consolethe those who have recourse to her, appeared unto the child and said: "What aileth thee, O my daughter?" And our holy Lady Mary embraced the child, who said: "They would not let me go to church to partake of the Offering on the holy festival of our Saviour's birthday." And our holy Lady, the two-fold Virgin Mary, said unto her: "Be not grieved, and come with me." And she carried the child to the church where she partook of the Offering with the folk who were enlightened.* Then our Lady Mary said unto her: "Three days hence I will take thee, and thou shalt be with me"; and three days later the child departed this life and the Virgin Mary made her like unto herself. And a certain good and righteous and God-fearing man saw the child arrayed in purple, and following our holy Lady, the two-fold Virgin Mary, the mother of the Life who redeemed us, and he marvelled greatly and he told the people concerning her. And those who heard this praised the glorious and Most High God and gave thanks unto our holy Lady, the Virgin Mary.

Then follows a little prayer in verse:

O Mary who didst make to follow thee
The little maid, and didst array her in purple:
Thy sandals are bound on, thy staff is in my hand,
Wheresoever thou goest, O my Lady, make thou me, even me,
to follow.
Blessed is the man who followeth the Lady Mary.

This story might well have been derived from either a Greek, Syriac, or Latin original, but in the following we are clearly transported to Egypt or to Abyssinia itself:

A miracle of our holy Lady, whose name is sweet, the two-fold Virgin Mary who gave birth to God. May her prayer and her blessing and the mercy of her beloved Son be with our King David† for ever and ever. Amen.

Now it came to pass on a day that three Arabs set sail for the country of Rif when the sea was very rough and the waves thereof

* Here is a phrase which carries us back to early patristic times, when, as distinct from the catechumens (*οἱ φωτισόμενοι*), who were not permitted to be present at the Liturgy or to communicate, those who had been actually baptized were called *οἱ φωτισθέντες*, "the illuminated".

† This seems to have been the David who reigned from 1508 to 1540. But the name David has been written over an erasure. The name which stood there before, obviously that of an earlier monarch, has in each case been carefully deleted.

ran high and they came into tribulation. . . . And the men according to the custom of their fathers prayed to their false prophet but they did not find deliverance. And it came to pass, when they were in despair of their lives, that one of them who had gone to the monastery of Kalmon and had seen the miracles wrought there cried out : "O Mary of the monastery of Kalmon, who didst at one time make intercession for me, deliver me. And if thou dost deliver me from drowning in this sea, I will give to thy church a camel-load of dates for the food of the monks, and the camel also shall belong to the monastery, so that it shall carry whatever the monks desire." And one companion said : "Yea, verily thou hast done well to mention this great name." But when the third Arab heard this speech he laughed at them and said : "O dogs, why do ye forsake your faith and make entreaty for mercy to Mary ?" And at that very moment he was overwhelmed in the sea, and a crocodile swallowed him ; but so that the man's companions might see him and the miracle might be made manifest to them, the creature brought him up again and held him in his mouth. Then the two men made supplication to our holy Lady, the Virgin Mary, and they found a mighty rock, and they climbed up upon it and stood in the midst of the raging water. And a ship which was passing that way came, and they embarked therein, and so they arrived in harbour.

Then straightway the Arab took a camel which was the finest of all his camels, and having laden it with dates he brought it to Solomon, the Abbot of the monastery of Kalmon, and to all the monks, and he related unto them everything which had taken place. Now this Arab's companion possessed many sheep and he sheared their wool and brought it to the monks, and said : "Take this wool and make of it clothing for yourselves, for the sake of our Lady Mary who delivered me from drowning." And when the monks heard his speech they gave praise unto the glorious and Most High God, and they extolled our holy Lady the Virgin Mary, who is gracious and full of compassion. May her prayer and blessing and the mercy of her beloved Son be with our King David for ever and ever ! Amen.

To this are appended the verses :

Of the Arab men in the raging water their strength
Was thy name, O Mary, when they remembered it aforetime.
Like the man who made mock of them,
Thine enemy, O my Lady, at every time and season
Shall become the food of the crocodile, and of the crusher of
their bones.

This story, like all the others in the Meux manuscript, is illustrated with pictures very brightly coloured. We see first the three Arabs in the water, then the crocodile obligingly exhibiting the upper half of his victim, which protrudes from his jaws, and finally the camel with its load of dates being ridden to the monastery.

More interesting from the point of view of ancient devotional practices is the story of the Christian priest, a Hebrew by race, who lived at Akhmim in Upper Egypt. This city was a great Coptic centre, and from the fourth century onwards monasteries had abounded in the neighbourhood.

In the city of Akhmim there was a certain Hebrew who loved our holy Lady the two-fold Virgin Mary, the Mother of God, from the depth of his heart, and the mention of her name with fear and trembling was never absent from his tongue ; and when he bowed down before her he was wont to kiss the ground in honour of her name. And the man was a priest, and he ministered devotedly in the church at the time of incense and of the Offering [i.e. the Mass liturgy]. And it came to pass that when the days of his youth were over he lacked strength and was unable to stand erect. And when the bishop knew that he had become feeble and was not able to stand up, he associated two deacons with him that they might give him assistance. Now one day as he was praising the name of our holy Lady, the two-fold Virgin Mary, the Mother of God, and was bowing down to the ground, he fell forward upon his breast and his backbone was broken. And he cried out with a loud voice, and said : "O my Lady Mary, come thou and help me in my fall." Then straightway our holy Lady the Virgin Mary appeared unto him, standing on the right of the altar, and she stretched out her hand to him and touched his backbone which was broken and made it whole, and she gave him a sign to come and stand on the right of the altar by her side. And immediately he saw this he rejoiced greatly, and he marvelled and was astonished at the beauty of her form and at the splendour which was upon her ; and his old age was renewed and he became a vigorous young man again. And he continued to minister in the church unto our holy Lady, the Virgin Mary, all his days, and she added unto the years of his life one hundred and thirty years, and all his days were two hundred and thirty years, and he died in peace and departed unto everlasting life. May her prayer and the mercy of her beloved Son be with our King David for ever and ever ! Amen.

The blessed Hebrew in the land of Akhmim who had grown old,
 Whilst praising thy name and bowing before thee, fell down.
 As thou didst appear unto him aforetime and didst speak with him
 what was right,

O Mary, appear thou unto me when I lay me down to die,
 For upon this thing is my mind set with great anxiety.

This ascetical exercise of prostrations seems to be very ancient indeed. Hegesippus, in the second century, reports that the Apostle St. James the Less bent his knees so often that they became hard like those of a camel. The inclinations or prostrations (*μειράνοισι*) of St. Simeon Stylites were so multiplied that those who tried to count them gave up the attempt in despair. The practice spread to Ireland and thence was adopted throughout the West, while it survives to this day among the monks of the Orthodox Greek Church and notably on Mount Athos. It is clear from many references in the book of miracles that this form of devotion was very familiar to the Abyssinians. Thus the monk Isaac, we are told, made three hundred prostrations every night, saying each time, "O my Lord, Jesus Christ, make me to see Thy Mother"; and the same number is accredited to another priest who was accustomed daily to bow down before the picture of Our Lady.*

Somewhat analogous to this was the practice of saluting separately all the members of the Blessed Virgin's body. This also was familiar in Western Europe, and a detailed exercise of this sort, involving twenty prayers and twenty genuflexions or prostrations, was long printed among the works of St. Albertus Magnus, though it is now attributed to another Dominican, Richardus a Sancto Laurentio. Whether the Ethiopic form of these devotions originated spontaneously in Africa or was borrowed from Europe it is impossible to say, but in one of the Meux manuscripts we find no less than forty-two salutations, transcribed like the rest in Ethiopic characters. Here are two specimens from Dr. Budge's translation :

* See Budge, *Miracles*, pp. 32 and 47. Graven images were not permitted in Abyssinian churches, but there was no objection to ikons or pictures.

Salutation unto thy knees when they are making supplication and intercession, and salutation unto thy feet which bend in adoration ceaselessly. O Mary, who hast become the companion of the Word of the Father, entreat thou Him graciously to bestow upon me the life of the soul when all sinners shall be cast into the fire.

There are crudities in some of these invocations which jar upon our modern sense of decorum, but the devotional feeling seems real enough, even if the thought be occasionally fantastic, as for example :

Salutation unto the hair of thy head which is like unto a two-fold thread of purple filled with the dew of the things which are good and which is without blemish. O thou who art the covenant of mercy, Mary, which thou didst stablish before the congregation, entreat Him to bestow the life of the soul as a gift of grace upon me after the manner of Elijah, for doth not He make me to live in the body.

Very curious is the story of the thirsty dog, which is narrated as an incident of the Blessed Virgin's life upon earth before her high dignity was revealed to her. We cannot, I fear, suppose that it was written with the idea of suggesting that compassion for animals was either a duty or a virtue. The reader was only meant to infer that Our Lady was so incredibly merciful that she took pity even on a dog.

Now one day there were two women with our Lady Mary, and a thirsty dog came between them and they drove him away, but our Lady Mary was exceedingly grieved when she saw how thirsty he was, and she wept. And the woman said unto her, "Wilt thou be more merciful unto this dog than we ? Shall not Christ, who is called the Messiah, be born of thee ?" Now when our holy Lady heard these words great joy entered into her heart. Then taking up her water pitcher, she went to a place some distance away, and having put off her shoes from her feet, she poured water into one of them and gave it to the thirsty dog to drink. And one of the women said unto her : "Why hast thou taken water for him from thy pitcher ? And if thy jar be broken thou wilt not find water elsewhere." Then our Lady Mary answered and said unto her : "The water is not that which cometh

forth from a well, but from heaven, and God who hath given this thirsty dog water to drink gave it unto me from above." . . .*

Feed thou me, O Mary, thy servant who is favoured,
With bread of beautiful knowledge and with wine of wisdom.
Even though my sin exceedeth computation,
Remember, O my Lady, in thy gracious kindness
Him that is in sore straits,
Even as thou didst give the thirsty dog water to drink.

The story in any case is eloquent of a land in which water is apt to be a precious commodity and may have to be fetched with much fatigue from a great distance.

But in contrast to those I have quoted, it must be confessed that some of these narratives are not exactly edifying. The insistence upon Our Lady's boundless compassion must inevitably suggest that one small act of devotion to her is sufficient to extinguish any accumulation of crimes. One of the most outrageous of these stories is that of a cannibal, nominally a Christian, who was a great lord and very powerful in his own province. We are told of him that

when he had devoured eight and seventy people, his friends and his acquaintances and his kinsfolk, the people who were in his service began to come to an end, and the men who remained fled from him that he might not be able to devour them. So he was left alone with his wife and his two children ; and them also he ate.

It happened, however, that some time after, going along a road, he met a poor beggar who was covered with leprosy. As the story expressly tells us, "he wished he could eat the poor man, but he did not like him because of his sores that were putrefying, and the horrible stench they emitted". The beggar asked him for water "for God's sake", but the cannibal only became greatly enraged. A second request in the name of the saints and martyrs was equally unsuccessful ; but when the leper made a third appeal, "In the name of Mary give me

* The meaning, I suppose, is that all good gifts come from God and that we are just as much dependent upon Him as the animals are. We have no right to count as our own even the things produced by our labour.

water to drink before my soul depart", the cannibal at last said: "Take and drink for Mary's sake." Nevertheless, when only a little water had gone down the man's throat, the cannibal seized him and stopped him from drinking before he was able to satisfy his thirst.

When this wicked murderer died soon after, the devils claimed him as their own and were carrying him off to hell, but Our Lady interceded with her Divine Son, who expostulated, saying: "But what good thing hath he done for thee?" She replied: "He gave a thirsty man water to drink in my name." Then Our Lord bade scales be brought in order to weigh the souls which the cannibal had devoured against the water which he gave the thirsty man to drink. Wonderful to tell, the little drop of water outweighed the eight and seventy souls, and thereupon, in the words of the narrator, "the angels of light who were looking on marvelled and gave shouts of joy because the cannibal had been saved and had been made to live, through the entreaty of our holy Lady Mary, the Mother of God".

The example is driven home by two striking pictures in which St. Michael holds the scales, and Our Lady clutches the naked little figure representing the dead man's soul by the feet, just as the Devil, depicted with horns, tail, and a cloven hoof, has gripped it round the neck and is in the act of flying away with it.

Although this is the most extravagant of all the examples of Our Lady's generosity in rewarding any slight service, there are a large number of others which suggest that heaven may be very cheaply purchased if a little prayer be said or any good deed performed in her honour. Unfortunately the same objection may be urged against a vast number of the *Marienlegenden* current in Western Europe, some of which have found their way into St. Alphonso Liguori's *Glories of Mary*. With us no great harm results from such exaggerations, for they are corrected by what the faithful are very plainly told both in the pulpit and in the confessional. But in Abyssinia there seems to have been nothing in the nature of clear moral teaching to correct the impression that a man could save his soul by an observance

of the traditional fasts or by some small act of piety performed in honour of the Mother of God.

Almost every missionary repeats the same complaint that the schismatics, though leading the most irregular lives, went to Communion without any previous confession, and that even if they did go through the form of confession they paid no attention to the need of accurate accusation and of real sorrow for their sins. One can believe that their genuine devotion to Mary, the Mother of God, may have obtained for them many unexpected graces in forms they did not quite recognize, but there seems only too much reason to fear that many were betrayed into a false presumption which might have to be very grievously expiated in the life beyond the grave. So far, however, as can be ascertained, no clear conception of purgatory formed part of their theological beliefs.

HERBERT THURSTON, S.J.

ECONOMIC IDEAS IN PORTUGAL

THE acute phase of the economic crisis will undoubtedly pass, as other similar phases have disappeared before, but the visible external symptoms that may vanish only constitute one aspect of the situation. The disorder is more deep-seated. It is this underlying cause that makes economic crises more and more frequent, and more violent and destructive each time they appear. It is this too that engenders a permanent condition of unrest, and at times actually threatens the existence of the manifold benefits that have accrued to civilization from centuries of human effort. The crisis today is not one merely of money, exchanges, credit, prices, and public finance; it is far graver, for it lies at the root of them all. It is a crisis of economic thought, and concerns the fundamental principles of economic life.

Our conception of wealth has become debased. We have dissociated it from its true function—that of maintaining a decent standard of life—and treated it as though it were a sphere of its own, having no connexion either with the interests of the community at large or with ethics. We have considered too that the ultimate purpose of individuals, States, and nations was simply to accumulate riches that had no social utility, without reference to the laws of justice in regard to their acquisition and use. Also our idea of work—and of the worker—became degraded. We forgot the respect due to the worker as a human being, we considered only his value as a productive machine. Thus we measured and utilized his capacity for work, completely forgetting that he is not an isolated unit, but forms part of a family, and that his life is intimately bound up with that of his wife, children, and home. We went a stage further and claimed his wife and children as minor, cheaper factors of production; isolated, independent units, that is, without ties, affections, or communal life. Thus we destroyed the nucleus of the family and increased competition amongst workers by the introduction of female labour.

We detached the worker from the natural framework of his trade. Freed from all professional ties, he was left

isolated ; without the discipline of association, though he gained freedom, he became weak. Then we allowed him to form new associations. He did so, but not for the purpose of adding something to the well-being of the community, conscious of the need of co-ordinating all the different factors of labour towards the production of wealth. The new associations he created were formed against somebody, or something : either the State, or his employers—whom he looked on as enemies—or even other fellow workers. We accepted at first the opinion that the State should adopt a completely passive and disinterested attitude towards the organization of national economy. Later we fostered a spirit of State intervention which led to compulsory regulation of the production, distribution, and consumption of wealth. Wherever this was done private enterprise began to dwindle away, an excessive number of government officials were created, taxes and the cost of living went up, production decreased, large sums of private wealth were squandered, and individual liberty was curtailed. Those who, starting from false premises, blindly accepted their logical conclusions proceeded to launch grandiose plans which appeared to be justified by scientific calculations and improved modern technique. But the free independent worker—the “man”—disappeared : he was caught up in the colossal wheels of the economic machine. Workers were mobilized as though they were parts of machinery for labour, and shifted about from one district to another like droves of cattle when the pasturage in one area is all eaten up.

Yes, the acute phase of the present crisis will certainly pass ; but it is of paramount importance to know whether a real attempt will be made to find a remedy for the underlying cause of disorder. For if we are witnessing the final test—and perhaps the liquidation—of democracy and individualism, we have already seen the failure of the old materialistic conception of economics. Along that road we can no longer travel. I can see no alternative but to substitute more just, true, and humane ideas of wealth, work, the family, the right of association and the State, in place of the grave errors which in the

past have clouded the vision of leaders of men in the world.

There exists in human beings an innate strain of vanity which makes them anxious to cut a good figure and make a fine show. This breeds a longing for things that are in reality superfluous. There is a certain element of truth in the saying that nothing is more necessary than what is superfluous ; nevertheless from a common-sense point of view it is an economic fallacy. For it entails allowing things that are not strictly necessary to usurp the place of others that are absolutely essential for the maintenance of life. The difference existing in some people's dress—when their underclothing is of cheaper material than their outer garments—and in the furnishing of their houses—when all signs of comfort are concentrated in the front drawing-room and the upstairs bedrooms are left cold and bare—is one trivial but picturesque aspect of a problem which at root is important. For centuries social life in Portugal has fostered a deceptive display of outward showiness out of all due proportion to real standards of life. The solution of this problem has been left to the instincts of human nature with unfortunate results. This glaring contrast was exploited and developed by producers for their own profit. The consequence was a dearth of absolutely indispensable things and an over-production of unnecessary goods.

We travelled even further—and along a worse road. Wealth was no longer harnessed to the service of human life ; and so production proceeded to neglect and injure and stifle it. The function of a State is to be the natural guardian and guide of a nation, and yet States made no attempt to check this economic suicide. There could hardly be anything more palpably absurd than to work in order to die, and to make destruction of human life the purpose of economic life. Human beings have many needs. As civilization advances, both human wants and accumulated riches to satisfy them tend to increase. But we ought never to lose sight of the fact that merely raising material standards of life alone, without

reaching a higher ethical plane, does not constitute true progress.

Hence riches, goods, and production do not constitute an end in themselves: they must be subordinated to the interests both of individuals and of the community. When they do not preserve and elevate human life they are valueless. To this one end should be co-ordinated all the productive factors in a nation. This is why national economy ought to be so organized as to produce the maximum quantity of things that are useful to the community, and why the State is in duty bound to safeguard morality and take an active interest in promoting public health.

Wealth is a product of work, and work is performed by the worker. The term *worker* should have in economics a wide meaning. It should include every type of intellectual or physical effort either directly or indirectly affecting production—whether it be that of a university professor or a children's nurse, of a policeman or an unskilled labourer. Work does not mean only manual labour—the purely mechanical work of controlling a machine, or doing work that could be done by a machine. Many other kinds of work play their part in production. In hours of apparent inactivity, devoted to silent thought and meditation, men who stand at the head of the stream of economic life organize the dispersed individual efforts of other men so as to increase the sum total of their common labour. The work of the inventor, the technician, and the head of the factory provides the ordinary workman with the means of gaining a livelihood.

Work in this sense is a social duty. The solidarity of interests which lies at the base of organized society makes it the duty of each individual to contribute his share—either by using his brains or by direct action—towards the well-being of the whole community. The man who does no work harms all the others. As work is a painful effort, the tendency of many is to seek to avoid it. It would be incorrect, though, to say that only the immediate needs of life compel men to work, and that a man must therefore possess no private property in order

to be subject to the law of work. If this has been so to a certain extent in the past, it has been the fault of education and social convention. Where public opinion is not sufficiently powerful, the arm of the law ought to reach and wage a successful battle against all merely parasitical forms of life.

Work—work of every kind—is equally worthy of honour and respect, when by work is meant the contribution of each individual, in proportion to his abilities, towards the well-being of the whole community. But although from a human standpoint every kind of work is equally worthy of honour, from a social and economic point of view not every kind of work is of equal value ; for not every kind of work is equally useful or equally productive. Therefore they cannot all receive an equal remuneration. This is why differences must exist between individuals, standards of life, and different classes in society. As our ideas on so many other points became debased, so too on this point we went astray. While some affected to despise manual labour, others, undervaluing their own intellectual superiority, claimed as a right to be called workers too. In the first instance there was an unjust disregard for the dignity of labour ; in the second a humiliating capitulation in face of the material power of the working classes. In each case a proper sense of proportion was lacking.

Underlying any valuation of work there must always be a recognition of the fundamental need of preserving and transmitting human life ; for at the base of any true conception of work stands the life of the worker. When beyond their potential capacity for work a number of men possess no other means of subsistence, two conclusions logically follow : first, that national economy should be so organized as to provide the worker with work ; second, that work should be so regulated as to give the worker a living wage. Wages are the most adequate remuneration for work. The worker may be associated in the undertaking, he may have a share in the profits ; but when his wages are insufficient he can neither make plans for the future nor temporarily knock off work. Therefore at the base of any of the many possible combinations of

work there should always be the idea of a living wage for the worker. No limit exists beyond which the worker's standard of life may not be raised. In so far as this harmonizes with the general economic condition of the country there is no reason why this standard should not steadily improve. There is no limit, therefore, to a rise in wages, but a minimum limit should be fixed so that they may not fall below what is necessary for the maintenance of a decent standard of living.

We shall now advance a stage higher and inquire whether production, which depends on the worker, can afford to ignore the family. The worker is not an isolated unit. He lives, as a rule, within the framework, not of the family into which he is born, but of that which he creates. Production, when it disregards the family, lays hold of those members capable of working, including the wife and young children. The apparent benefit to the family of an increase in wages is not a very real one. A family means a home with its moral and economic atmosphere. The employment of female labour tends to destroy the home, separating from it the members of the family, and to a certain extent rendering them strangers one to another. With the disappearance of communal life the education of the children suffers and domestic economy is hampered, and sometimes even rendered impossible. The material advantages to a family of a slight increase in wages can scarcely compensate for this loss.

Sometimes, too, the part played by moral factors in making work profitable is overlooked. A sense of fun, a happy disposition, and the sheer joy of feeling alive increase both the quality and the quantity of the products of labour. These sources of energy are derived more than anywhere else from the family. The existence, therefore, of the worker's family is a distinct economic asset.

The existence of the family entails two other things, private property and the right to inherit it. The intimacy of family life demands a certain degree of comfort and privacy: a house, an independent house, a house of one's own—in a word, a home. It is impossible

—in many cases it would be inadvisable—for the worker to possess the means of production, or that land should be so divided up that each worker should have a small patch to cultivate. It is, though, an excellent thing that the instinct of possession innate in man's nature should be exercised in bettering the material conditions of his home. A family living beneath its own roof-tree is naturally more frugal, stable, and solidly constituted. For this reason great barracks, colossal workmen's buildings with huge restaurants and communal tables, are scarcely to be desired. High moral standards are better secured by small, independent dwellings inhabited by families that have full rights of ownership over them.

The instinct of perpetuity in a race may be interpreted in terms of property by the idea of inheritance; for with blood are transmitted also the results of labour, saving, and sometimes great privations. No social advantage would be gained by restricting the right of inheritance simply to goods of enjoyment and consumption, and by excluding goods of production. Economic activity derives a natural stimulus from the idea of the possible free disposal of its results. Such an idea adds to the solidity and stability of the family, for it provides an indispensable element of steadiness in the ups and downs of life; many events may occur with which the best-conducted and most complete insurance agency can never cope.

In the sphere of his professional activity, also, the worker should not be an isolated unit. His natural tendency is to enter into partnership with other workers so that he may better safeguard the material and moral interests of his profession. Now, a professional association is—on account of the common nature of interests within the sphere of production—the best basis on which to organize labour; it is the pivot round which revolve all those agreements entered into with a view to raising it to a higher plane and protecting it from injustice and misfortune.

There can be no question of reintroducing today, into the highly developed and complicated mechanism of

production, the old familiar relationship, that formerly existed between master and man. This loss can, however, in part be compensated for by the creation within the business of a new type of relationship, the basis of which is the trade union. In place of an indefinite variety of combinations between the different factors of production, a new relationship can be created by the syndicate applicable to interests of the same nature for the purpose of settling questions concerning remuneration and conditions of work.

A profession derives from a trade union cohesion and a proper sense of dignity. For there can be no union unless there is a corporative spirit, a consciousness of the value of work and of the place it occupies in the whole scheme of production, and a realization of the need of co-operating with all the other factors in order to improve the economic condition of the nation. Where such qualities are lacking, and where there exists instead merely a spirit of class warfare, there is no true union, but only a revolutionary association, a force at the service of disorder.

The whole process of production may be organized on the basis of professional associations with a view to studying its problems, discovering its possibilities, and regulating its movements. Moreover, the extension of the principle of professional association to the intellectual and moral aspects of a nation's life permits their perfect organization and incorporation in the State—although they should never be identified with the State; and this in a better and truer manner than by means of what is called today national representation.

Above the nation as an economic unit there exists the State. How far may the economic organization be considered part of its political organization? The two things are not identical. Economic organization is something quite distinct from political organization. This does not mean, however, that the State should have no economic doctrine, nor guide from above the economic life of the country, nor utilize wealth to ensure its own strength and prosperity. The State can never adopt an

attitude of complete detachment from the economic life of the country and from the principles guiding its development.

In spite of the clear lessons of past experience, many hold that the State should take over the organization of the production and distribution of wealth. There are advocates of State control of credit, means of transport, building, mining, forestry, various branches of agricultural and industrial production, of trade in certain articles—sometimes even of all export trade. But apart from those exceptional moments of crisis when there exists an urgent need of preserving in the best way possible the most important economic values of national life, the function of the State should be more limited and essentially different.

This process of socialization would produce no economic advantage—an increase in production of wealth under better conditions of cost—nor social advantage—more just distribution of profits and a more suitable atmosphere for the valorization of individuals—nor even political advantage—greater independence for the State, a better guarantee of public freedom, or more effective protection of the interests of the community. The State should keep on a higher level than that of the world of production. It should neither absorb and monopolize nor intervene and compete. The State should not be the lord and master of national wealth, nor be placed in a position where it is liable to be corrupted by it. In order to be the supreme arbiter between conflicting interests it must not be too closely identified with any one of them.

The normal duty of the State is to protect and guide national economic life in regard to external defence, public peace, administration of justice, technical efficiency and development of instruction, and the performance of all those services which are auxiliary to economic activity ; so as to be able to correct the faults that sometimes arise from the free interplay of private activities. Unfortunately, the free action of individuals does not always lead to just treatment, nor do actual relationships always prove satisfactory, on account of the economic

inferiority of a large number of individuals. Hence our desire for justice in social relationships should lead us to protect the weak from the possible abuses of the strong, and the poor from the disabilities attached to their poverty. There is in this moderate form of State intervention an educational purpose; for progress does not mean that the function of the State should be enlarged, thereby dispossessing individuals, but rather that the State should relinquish certain fields of activity whenever it can be proved that private initiative is sufficient.

We want a high standard of justice and equilibrium between all classes to govern the economic life of the nation. We want work to possess a sense of dignity and personal property to be brought into harmony with the needs of society. We want to travel along a new economic road, working in unison with human nature under the authority of a strong State which is capable of defending the higher interests of the nation both from Capitalist excesses and from Bolshevik destructiveness. We desire to satisfy the claims of the working classes within the limits of order, justice, and national balance. We wish to defend the proletariat from its false apostles, and to show the masses that we are separated from them by no economic question, but only by a different conception of life, another idea of civilization. We shall never permit what is transcendent, eternally true, and beautiful in our Lusitanian, Latin, and Christian traditions to perish when they are threatened by a new epoch of barbarism.

OLIVEIRA SALAZAR.

DWIGHT MORROW AND HIS CIRCLE

Dwight Morrow. By Harold Nicolson. (Constable. 18s.)
The Report of the Pecora Investigation into Stock Exchange Practices.
Report No. 1455, Senate, 73rd Congress, 2nd Session.
(Washington.)

ALTHOUGH Dwight Morrow died only four years ago his memory is already remote, except perhaps in the diplomatic and financial world. Journalists may remember him as the outstanding delegate to the London Naval Conference of 1930. Before that he had been Ambassador to Mexico, where much of his public fame will rest. There he achieved a diplomatic reputation by his settlement of an oil dispute which had for years caused strained relations between the Mexican Foreign Office and the State Department at Washington. There also an attempt was made by Plutarco Calles to compromise his diplomatic independence, as an offset to the protests of the Knights of Columbus, in the period following the execution of Fr. Miguel Pro. It will be remembered of Dwight Morrow, at least by Catholics, that his efforts to establish a *modus vivendi* between the Church and the Mexican Government were unremitting, and even partially successful, during the years of his ambassadorship. But no doubt he is most easily recalled to mind today by the name of his courageous daughter, Anne Spencer Morrow, whose marriage with Colonel Lindbergh was the romantic outcome of a demonstration flight to Mexico City, undertaken by the airman at the suggestion of the Ambassador. Colonel Lindbergh played for the United States the role played by the Prince of Wales for Great Britain. It was a principle of a diplomacy which relied in part upon newspaper correspondents and camera-men, that their visits fostered goodwill between nations.

The comparative obscurity of Dwight Morrow among the great figures of the twentieth century is sharply emphasized by the terms of Mr. Nicolson's eulogy :

The point about Dwight Morrow [he writes] is that, while representing the perfected type of American, he also became a

model for the completely civilized man. It is thus justifiable to approach him from the human, or universal, rather than from the national, or particular, point of view.

Again we read that "in the varied and rapid extension of his career he developed a new type of civilized mind". Dwight Morrow had become "a master of them that know", and in his meetings with the autumnal politicians of Europe "he gave a touch of dawn to the greying lights of European afternoons". Nor is this only Mr. Nicolson's opinion. "It was", declares Professor Gilbert Murray, "Morrow's breadth of vision and understanding, his comprehension of the slow movement of history and human development, that made him one of the outstanding men of our time." And Mr. Montague Norman records the equal impression that

His imagination was as vivid and varied as his mind. The two seemed trained to work together in harmony and I like to believe that this harmony between imagination and intellect, this union between soul and mind, lies at the very roots of genius. It is from this union that may be traced the personal sympathy which surely was the outstanding characteristic of Dwight Morrow. To him indeed it was the *way* of self-expression.

Nevertheless, when we go on to mention that this model for the completely civilized man, this master of them that know, was one of the most brilliant corporation lawyers in America, and a partner in the House of Morgan, a new problem presents itself. Mr. Dooley long ago noted of the corporation lawyer that he could transform a law which had been designed as a stone wall into a triumphal arch. It is hardly possible to believe that Dwight Morrow himself, with his whimsical and honest character, ever used his powers deliberately to outflank laws made for the protection of the people. "Although", he used to say after his retirement, "I never helped J. P. Morgan and Co. to make much money, I certainly prevented them from losing it." He called himself a lawyer in a banking house, and his own chief talent was for a prodigious assimilation of facts on any subject set before him, whether the copper industry, or the

mechanics of war-time financing, or Mexican oil, or the technicalities of naval categories. Yet it is undeniable that the House of Morgan has been deeply distrusted by the American people almost continually since the beginning of the century. In 1914, when Morrow entered the firm, it was a recent memory that J. P. Morgan the elder had been cross-examined at the Pujo investigation. Two years after Dwight Morrow's death, J. P. Morgan the younger was to be cross-examined at the Pecora investigation. There was a continuity between the two events—although during the post-war boom years the pressure of suspicion was somewhat relaxed—for the recommendations of the Pujo investigation, pigeon-holed at the time, were incorporated in the banking legislation of the New Deal ; and even during the boom years the American approval of the House of Morgan was apt to be cynical.

In this day and generation [wrote the *New Republic* in November 1925, when it was suggested that President Coolidge might make Morrow his Secretary of the Treasury], with everybody intent on grabbing for money and everybody getting a little, a connexion with the House of Morgan isn't a liability. It is now classed as an asset. As to hurting Mr. Coolidge politically if he put Mr. Morrow in as Secretary of the Treasury, nothing will hurt Mr. Coolidge politically until the people as a whole get a crack over their collective skull that starts their mental machinery moving again.

Prophetic words, applying beyond President Coolidge to the whole political machinery of the United States ! In 1914 people still remembered the elder Morgan's curious offer to the "trust-busting" Theodore Roosevelt, when the latter moved for the dissolution of the Northern Securities Company under the Sherman Act, and seemed likely to proceed against the Steel Corporation. Morgan at once visited Washington to interview the President. "If we have done anything wrong," he said, "send your man to my man and we can fix it up." Today, in conditions of more open conflict, the American people see another Morgan challenge another Roosevelt, when the United Gas Company, which has holdings in many States of £160,000,000, refuses to register as a public

utility. "Millions controlled by Mr. J. P. Morgan were hurled into the fight against the New Deal today", declares the *New York Daily News*, which describes the United Gas Company as "one of the largest utility-holding companies under Morgan control".* The popular suspicion against the House of Morgan was such that not even President Coolidge (who was Morrow's contemporary at Amherst) or President Hoover, let alone the Democratic President Wilson, would willingly see the famous corporation lawyer figure prominently at Washington. Yet its power grew to be all-pervading.

Through the personal prestige of some of its members [says one writer (perhaps with Dwight Morrow in mind)], and the wide ramifications of its influence in the political, financial and diplomatic worlds, the Morgan firm had been for years a powerful and at times controlling influence in American policy at home and abroad. If the United States had an invisible government, the House of Morgan held its chief portfolios.†

This opinion is by no means exceptional in the literature of American politics and finance.

It may be that Mr. Nicolson accepts too readily the best that can be said for the Morgans, but his eulogy of Morrow is sincere and (from a widely recognized point of view) well deserved. It is interesting to observe that Dwight Morrow himself accepted the banker's offer only after considerable heart-searching. He had no love for wealth: he often used to say that his ambitions would be satisfied with £20,000, after which he would retire from the practice of law in order to teach history.‡

* Quoted by the *Daily Telegraph*, 21 November, 1935.

† Ernest K. Lindley, in *The Roosevelt Revolution: First Phase*, 1934, p. 125.

‡ Andrew Carnegie, who sold out his enormous steel interests to J. P. Morgan the elder in 1901, had the same distrust of wealth. At the age of thirty-three he had written in a private memorandum, which he carefully kept thereafter, that "the amassing of wealth is one of the worst species of idolatry, no idol more debasing. To continue much longer overwhelmed by business cares and with most of my thoughts wholly upon the way to make more money in the shortest time must degrade me beyond hope of permanent recovery." It was thirty years later, as a multi-millionaire, that he retired, making every effort to spend his vast wealth for the public benefit. This memorandum is quoted by Frederick Lewis Allen in *The Lords of Creation*, 1935, p. 17.

Indeed, Dwight Morrow's inner feelings expressed themselves just before the Morgan offer in a dream to which Mr. Nicolson gives something of the character of premonition :

One night, in the little-known house on Spring Lane, Mrs. Morrow had been startled from her sleep by yells of pain and fear. She hurried to her husband's assistance. "Betsy," he panted, "I have had the most horrible nightmare. It was truly horrible. It was all so vivid, it was all so ghastly ! It seemed real, Betsy, it seemed so *real* ! . . ." and at the recollection of his nightmare he groaned repeatedly aloud. "What was it ?" she asked him. "What was it that you dreamt ?" "It was terrible," he groaned. "It was all so vivid, somehow. I dreamt, Betsy, that we had become rich. But *enormously* rich." "But, Dwight," she answered, "that's nothing to be scared about ! You can trust me to set *that* right." He was comforted by this assurance, and silence descended upon that happy little household. But the nightmare came true.

Morrow's final decision to accept the new position was fortified when he saw a cartoon in a New York paper in which Mr. J. P. Morgan was represented as a vulture preying upon the entrails of the shareholders in the New Haven Railroad.

He well knew that but for the support given by the firm of Morgan, the said shareholders would have had no entrails at all. He was incensed by the injustice of this cartoon, and the flame of knight-errantry which always gleamed as a little lamp among the arches of his intelligence blazed up in indignation. . . . Dwight Morrow always had a protective passion for the misunderstood.*

* In this case the misunderstanding was general ; it still endures. J. P. Morgan the elder had attempted to build up a transportation monopoly in New England through the medium of the New Haven Railroad. The president of the road, Charles S. Mellen, was reported to have declared that he "wore the Morgan collar" and was proud of it. Clearly the New Haven received the support of Morgan, for it bought up the Boston and Maine Railroad, the Maine Central, the New York, Ontario and Western ; it acquired steamship companies, street-railway companies, electric-light and water and gas companies. In 1913, after its bonded indebtedness had multiplied nearly twenty-fold in nine years, the New Haven was obliged to pass its dividend, "thereby beginning the impoverishment of many a New England family". A Government suit under the Sherman Act smashed its monopoly and its directors were criminally indicted. (See *The Lords of Creation*, pp. 172, 173.) Mr. Nicolson, by the way, is sometimes unconvincing on the subject of Morrow. In 1927 Morrow gave

Whatever might be the opinion of cartoonists, Morrow found nothing but quiet refinement in those club-like Wall Street offices which face the United States Sub-Treasury. He entered upon the work because it gave opportunity for a wider service. He was impressed with the younger Morgan's candour and frankness and his plans for the future of his House. Moreover, he had known Davison and Lamont for a long time and greatly admired them. There is no reason at all to suppose that during thirteen years of association with these bankers Morrow knowingly compromised any of his principles, though it may be gathered that he learned to relish power. When it became necessary for him to resign, on his appointment to Mexico, the thought uppermost in his mind was that he would have to wrench himself away from old friends. It must be one of the oddest freaks of literature that a Morgan partner quoted Chesterton to console himself for resignation from the firm.

To borrow a line from the "Ballad of the White Horse" [wrote Morrow to his wife], I must *choose* the risky things rather than the

"slow moons like silver rings,
And the ripening of the plums."

. . . For your own information, I do not count it a sacrifice to give up either the income or the power, important as they both are. The sacrifice is to give up the intimate association with the friends.

What is the solution of this paradox, that a man of pre-eminent character, and (to repeat) a model for the completely civilized man, yet found his spiritual home in the Morgan offices? Possibly the high citadel of finance has been unjustly attacked. Possibly its secret influence has been exaggerated. It is true, for example, that J. P. Morgan and Co., with its partner firms—

Litvinov a warm letter of recommendation to Sir Arthur Salter at Geneva. At Paris in the same year he entertained Rakovsky at a dinner-party. "The Russians were unable to account for this sudden solicitude on the part of a member of the house of Morgan. They did not realize that Dwight Morrow had an insatiable appetite for the misunderstood." The New England shareholders and the Russian peasants were more deserving of sympathy.

Drexel and Co. of Philadelphia ; Morgan, Grenfell and Co. of London ; and Morgan et Cie. in Paris—was only one of the great banking houses. On the witness-stand at the Pujo investigation, Mr. J. P. Morgan was continually emphatic about “all the bonds in Christendom”, thereby indicating a tradition of thought in his House differing from the traditions of the Rothschilds or of Kuhn, Loeb and Co. The various firms have not always seen eye to eye, but that their operations in the past have given them something like a monopolistic control over the economic systems of nations is the conviction to which many investigators have arrived. Mr. Thomas W. Lamont (a Morgan partner) put the matter delicately in his comments on the American Power Trust : “I wouldn’t say, if I were you, that there was anything in the nature of a trust. There isn’t anything like that at all ; what I would say is just simply that we and the banks and certain other companies interested in Power were all standing around in a co-operative frame of mind.”* The Pujo Committee, which collected evidence for the House of Representatives in 1912-13, was more explicit. Having examined in particular the ramified interests of the Morgan-Baker-Stillman group, it came to the conclusion that a national “money trust” existed, and this it described in phrases which ring familiarly today :

If, therefore, by a “money trust” is meant an established and well-defined community of interest between a few leaders of finance which has been created and is held together through stock holdings, interlocking directorates, and other forms of dominion over banks, trust companies, railroads, public-service and industrial corporations, and which has resulted in a vast and growing concentration of control of money and credit in the hands of a comparatively few men, your committee . . . has no hesitation in asserting as a result of its investigations up to this time that the condition thus described exists in this country today.†

The Pujo Committee estimated that the group held 341 directorships in 112 concerns having aggregate

* Quoted by Christopher Hollis in *The Two Nations*, 1935, p. 239.

† See *The Lords of Creation*, p. 178.

resources or capitalization of over twenty-two billion dollars. But that was nothing as compared with the general conditions revealed by the Pecora investigation twenty years later, for in the meantime America had shone as a great lending country, there had been a huge inflationary boom on the Stock Exchange, and the technique of "pyramiding" companies had been elaborated so as to allow the apex company to exercise over them all a maximum of control with a minimum of share-capital.* The prestige of the Morgans as a lending house was easily supreme. During the war they acted as agents for Allied purchases of war-materials as well as for Allied loans. After the war they were in the field of frenzied international lending all over the world, a fact which gave them inevitably many important interests in the political and industrial fortunes of foreign countries. It can be said that for the most part they politely followed the rules of the game (with the Cuba loans as a known exception) but the question arises whether that game should ever have been played at all: the Morgans were making a profit from a lien upon foreign countries, passing on the burden of possible loss to the American investor.

Internally, Morgan financial policy was such as to encourage the speculative mania of the nineteen-twenties, and although their wide offerings to the public were held to be a distribution of ownership in industrial corporations, the real effect was to transfer effective power to the few insiders.

While the number of investors has multiplied [says the Pecora Report], the control of industry has become concentrated in the hands of a relatively few persons whose personal stake in the enterprises they control may be exceedingly small. The result is a host of evils which accompany the divorcement of control from ownership. With ownership scattered among hundreds of thousands of stockholders it becomes difficult for these stockholders to exercise any effective influence over the management.

* The Insull pyramid was the most famous, but hardly less complex was that of the Van Sweringen brothers, railway magnates, supported by Morgan finance. Their system reached from Chicago to the Atlantic and southward almost to Mexico. Fourteen large companies were interlocked under Van Sweringen control, although the brothers' financial interest was 8.6 per cent in one company, 4.1 in another, and 0.25 per cent in a third.

On the other hand, the inside position gave opportunity for the Morgans and others to offer shares privately to persons who "held prominent governmental, political, and corporate positions". Among the fortunates figuring in the Morgan "preferred list" for Alleghany Corporation stock were John J. Raskob, Chairman of the National Democratic Committee, Joseph Nutt, Chairman of the Republican National Committee, Charles Francis Adams, Secretary of the Navy, Edmund Machold, Speaker of the Assembly of the State of New York, Silas H. Strawn, President of the United States Chamber of Commerce and President of the United States Bar Association, William Woodin, President of the American Car and Foundry Co., subsequently Secretary of the Treasury.* The "preferred list" for Standard Brands stock included F. H. Ecker, President of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., which was a heavy purchaser of securities for Norman H. Davis, for Calvin Coolidge, and for Bernard M. Baruch, the financier.

Some idea of the extent to which the Morgan power had grown since the Pujo investigation may be gathered from the statistics of Morgan directorships. The partners of J. P. Morgan and Co. and Drexel and Co. (numbering twenty-four persons) held 126 directorships and trusteeships in eighty-nine companies, excluding subsidiaries, with \$19,929,396,475 total resources for seventy-five of these companies. The boards of directors of eighty-two of these eighty-nine companies contained 537 non-member partners of J. P. Morgan and Co., who held directorships in 2175 companies in addition. The total resources of 1003 of these 2175 additional companies were \$100,890,413,407; they included 217 banks and trust companies, 129 securities companies, 316 railroads, 262 public-utility companies, 831 industrial companies, 154 insurance companies, and 266 miscellaneous corporations. The community of interest between the financier and his co-directors was cemented by the extension of loans and by the benefits of the "preferred list". If these

* At the time of the Pecora investigation, President Roosevelt gave orders that no names were to be suppressed, although the disclosures affected some of his own lieutenants.

figures are too large for comprehension, it may be enough to add that the member-partners of the House of Morgan paid a total of eleven million dollars in Federal taxes for the year 1929 alone; and, even so, the Pecora investigation disclosed that the Federal taxation authorities "accepted without examination income-tax returns prepared by J. P. Morgan and Co. on the assumption that preparation by that firm *ipso facto* established the correctness of the returns. . . . Thus, in 1930, according to the Bureau's own records, one day was spent in checking the partnership return of J. P. Morgan and Co. and Drexel and Co.—the most powerful banking group in the world."

When we draw the mildest conclusion possible, that the House of Morgan represented at the very least an *imperium in imperio*, a political and economic problem—if not a menace—of the first magnitude, we have still to explain why Dwight Morrow found at 23 Wall Street a haven of bucolic peace. The possible explanations are various, and for our day most interesting. In the first place, Morrow's genius was mathematical and his great power was for the assimilation of facts.

He demonstrated [writes Mr. Nicholson of his diplomatic phase] that co-operation between the peoples of the world can more effectively be achieved by a meticulous though tolerant investigation of basic facts than by any adjustments of current political or economic theories. He demonstrated also that the hurried imprecisions of democratic diplomacy are but frivolous factors in the stream of progressive evolution, and that effective agreements bearing upon concrete points are more valuable to mankind than any ineffective idealisms, however righteous or comprehensive these may seem.

The neo-Darwinian who grubs about the earth, seeking evidence to prove the existence of the Missing Link, often triumphantly produces as a fact what subsequent examination proves to be a bear's tooth; and in the course of his search he often misjudges the living, suffering, and idealistic mankind about him. It is presumably true that Dwight Morrow, at work in the Morgan office, could produce the most ingenious and comprehensive

scheme to cover a merger or an international loan without imagining it for one moment from the point of view of a Methodist shop-keeper in Spokane or of a Catholic peasant in Bavaria. All his instincts were for justice: he himself would have preferred shareholders to receive smaller dividends and wage-earners to receive better pay. But it is difficult to find any indication that he understood the principles of banking; that is to say, from the traditional and Christian point of view. If we had asked him the point-blank question: "Does money breed?" he would no doubt have replied with complete sincerity, "Yes." And although he understood history in a sense—when he was away from Wall Street in 1916 he chafed to get back: "J. P. Morgan and Co. are making history and we are not in New York to enjoy it"—yet, if he had retired from banking in order to teach history, no doubt he could have written a chronicle of the modern world without mentioning the Rothschilds, the Barings, the Kahns, the Dillons, or the Morgans. Morrow was educated in the Whig tradition.

Hence another reason why Morrow was at home in the House of Morgan. His Amherst education exactly fitted him for philosophical fact-finding, between which and traditional Christianity there is a gulf of four centuries. Mr. Nicolson tells a revealing story of Morrow, immersed in a knotty problem of finance, sitting out a long luncheon in complete silence, eating not a thing, and then suddenly starting up in triumph, the whole scheme in his head: "I have mutualized the Equitable!" *Conclusum est contra Manichaeos!* Or there is the point that the undertone of his business life, the constant *motif* in the rhythm of his philosophy, was the old prayer from the Phaedrus: "Beloved Pan, and all ye other gods who haunt this place, give me beauty in the inward soul; and may the outward and the inward man be at one. . . ." This prayer, amid the rush and rattle of Wall Street, was continually on his lips. It was read above his coffin when he lay dead. Now, in the evolution of American finance through the twentieth century it was exactly this type of university graduate that came to the fore. Morrow was watched and chosen by the House of Morgan

because he was of outstanding brilliance and of outstanding integrity. Most of his colleagues were to be men of his own stamp. If their abilities fitted them for administration and diplomatic succession in the country's service, that was no evidence necessarily of a financial plot. Rather it was the outcome of an educational system, rooted in the transformation of centuries, which gave to the money-lender the supreme power in the State.

The question remains whether Dwight Morrow did develop a new type of civilized mind ; and as a supplementary question it may be asked whether the type of mind so exalted is a high product of Christian civilization. This is the point of importance. Anybody who has read the biographical literature, the memoirs and the diaries, which concern great statesmen and diplomats of the twentieth-century Anglo-Saxon world must often have noticed the emergence of a new type of civilized mind. There is not infrequently a background of great wealth, with international ramifications, and of family connexions which become dynastic. There is an extremely powerful intellect, trained by the Whigs on German and Greek philosophy, and on the economics of the Manchester school, accepting as a law of being the modern political constitution with the alternate rule of two parties. At all events there is the philosopher rather than the saint : the philosopher who loves to speculate about religion on the basis of ethics. That men of this type, men like Balfour and Walter Page, are highly civilized it would be idle to deny. They are urbane, international, encyclopædic in knowledge, swayed by deep feelings ; and however anxious they may be to identify themselves with the common people, they live in a world as unlike the world of the man in the street as the cheese in a St. James club is unlike the cheese in a chain tea-shop. Americans of this class are often more sympathetic figures than their British counterparts because they have won entrance to it by their own abilities, and for that reason the observer notes (under a prevailing fear of European decline) a touch of dawn contrasted with the greying lights of European afternoons.

"The lights are going out all over Europe. They will not be lit again in our lifetime." A generation has passed since Sir Edward Grey pronounced his famous valediction to the old order on the last evening of the European peace. The experiences of a generation, however, and especially the events of the past six years, suggest that perhaps it is only the new type of civilized mind that is doomed to extinction after a brief heyday. There is a stirring of the older things in the old Europe, and in America there is some promise of a culture which will have one spiritual expression, of a culture which will turn away from philosophy to religion, from thought to contemplation, from production to creativeness. For everywhere men are accepting the lesson recently elaborated by Mr. Christopher Hollis from Disraeli's hint in *Sybil*, that in the modern nation there are two nations, the rich and the poor.* That is the appeal echoed by President Roosevelt on behalf of "the forgotten man". And that is a significance attachable to the most widely quoted passages from two Encyclicals: on the one hand there are the masses of the labouring poor, on the other hand there is the small class made up of the controllers of credit (against whose will none dare breathe) and of the few who benefit by credit operations. The ancient Greeks, for whom slavery was a law of Nature, produced a splendidly philosophical but unreligious civilization. When we, who are the heirs of Christendom, find that the flower of our civilization is a splendidly philosophical but unreligious type, our historical sense at least should prompt us to ask whether we have not accepted slavery as the price of such good lives.

GREGORY MACDONALD.

* See also R. McNair Wilson in *The Defeat of Debt*, 1935, chap. xviii.

ENGLAND'S CATHOLIC POPULATION IN PENAL TIMES

(Continued from THE DUBLIN REVIEW, October, 1935.)

THE evidence of the registered estates and of the lists of 1680, it is true, does not relate to the mass of the people. The influence of the gentry, however, over their tenants and dependants was, at this time, still very great, and, for the most part, the principle *cujus regio, ejus religio* must be the key to the allegiance of the common people. This is borne out by countless local records. William Blundell, for example, of Crosby, in Lancashire, writes that not a single Protestant tenant is to be found on his estate. The assumption that the percentage of Catholic gentry is an index for the whole population can be tested by an extremely valuable piece of evidence, which, though perhaps not so completely reliable as the evidence from the registered estates, is still of very great importance. Taken in conjunction with the *a priori* case for supposing a gentleman's tenants and dependants to be of his religion, it is very convincing.

Joseph Berington, a Catholic priest, writes in 1781 as follows :*

By the returns lately given in the House of Lords, it appears that the actual number of Catholics in England and Wales amounts to 69,376.† I had before fixed it at 60,000, and, considering how very uncertain all such returns must be from various causes, perhaps my calculation was not erroneous. . . . We have at this day but 7 peers, 22 baronets and about 150 landed gentlemen.

The total number of Catholic gentlemen in 1781 therefore appears to have been 179, and the total Catholic population about 60,000. That is, one gentleman for every 335 of the Catholic population. In 1692, Gregory

* *The State and behaviour of the English Catholics.* Other passages from Berington support the view that the tenants and dependants of a landowner were of his religion. He writes that "When a family of distinction fails, so there seldom continues any convenience either for prayers or instruction, the neighbouring Catholics soon fall away, and, when a priest is maintained, the example of the Lord is wanting to encourage the lower classes particularly to the practice of their religion."

† This figure is confirmed in Hansard.

King estimates 16,586 gentlemen, and a total population of 5½ millions, that is, one gentleman for every 332 in the population. If Berington's figures are correct (and at this later date there is a strong probability that they are, since the Penal Laws had been relaxed, and there was not the same necessity for men to conceal their religion),* and if King's estimates are correct, the case is proved. Again, it would seem that the correspondence of the figures is more than a coincidence. If 179 gentlemen represent a Catholic population of 60,000, then the 814 Catholic gentlemen of 1715-1720 should represent a Catholic population of 273,000, which is almost exactly 5 per cent of the population at that time.

If the returns given to the House of Lords are accepted, 179 gentlemen then represent a Catholic population of 69,376. In that case, the 814 gentlemen of 1715-20 should represent a total Catholic population of 315,000, which is 5.7 per cent. Finally, it should be noted that the number of Catholic gentlemen in 1715 must have been greater than 814. The conclusion would seem to be that the Catholics were probably one-twentieth of the population in 1715, and one-tenth in 1680.

There is, of course, the element of uncertainty as to the precise definition of a "gentleman". Does the term, as used in the registers of 1715-20, refer to exactly the same social classes that Gregory King had in mind? Does Berington use the term in the same sense? If Berington used the word "gentleman" to denote a wider or a more restricted social class than those so described in the registers of 1715-20, the foregoing deductions may not be entirely valid. Our general knowledge of the rigidity of the social structure in the eighteenth century supports the view that the term has a similar significance in all three cases, but this is not entirely borne out, as far as Berington's figures are concerned, by a comparison of average incomes.

The average income ascribed by Gregory King to knights, esquires, and gentlemen is £327 per annum. The average registered rental of the Catholic knights,

* See also the Bishop of Chester's defence of the 1781 returns and criticism of earlier returns, quoted below.

esquires, and gentlemen of 1715-20 is £265 per annum, but this is much less than their total income. As noted above, the registered rentals did not include copyhold and leasehold fines, nor the annual value of the lands occupied by the proprietors. Moreover, the income arising from land is greater than the annual value (which is here taken to mean the rent at which land is let to a tenant). The gross income arising from land must be sufficient to enable the tenant to pay the rent, and to support himself and his family as well. The income arising from lands occupied by the proprietors must therefore be greater than the "annual value" of those lands. Indeed, the presumption of modern income-tax law is that the income is roughly double the annual value. The average total income of the Catholic gentlemen of 1715-20 may easily have amounted to £400 or £500 per annum, which is a good deal higher than Gregory King's figure of £327. Does it follow from this that the term "gentleman" as used in the registers of 1715-20 applied to a more restricted and wealthier social class than it did as used by Gregory King? If this is so, for purposes of comparison, the number of Catholic gentlemen must have been higher than the figure taken from the registers, and the Catholic gentry would therefore be more than 5 per cent of the total number.

This explanation of the discrepancy does not, however, appear to be the most likely one. In the first place, the registers of 1715-20 are not limited to the gentry; they include representatives of all classes. If no members of the lower classes had been registered, it might have been argued that only the more important and prominent gentry were required to register their names and estates, but this is certainly not the case. In the second place, the average income ascribed by Gregory King to baronets is £880 per annum, while the average registered rentals of Catholic baronets is £1309 per annum, and their total income must therefore have been, say, £1500 per annum. Similarly, according to King, the average income of peers was £2800 per annum, while the average registered rental of the Catholic peers amounts to £3665.

It is therefore clear that the average income of the Catholic gentry was higher than the general level, as estimated by King, and this not merely for the plain "gentlemen", but also for peers and baronets. In the case of peers and baronets, no difficulty of definition arises. The fact that the average income of the Catholic gentlemen appears to have been higher than the average income ascribed by Gregory King to gentlemen is thus no evidence that the term is used in different senses in King's statistics and the Catholic registers. On the contrary, the evidence suggests that the term is used in the same sense in both cases.

There are only two possible explanations of the disparity between the figures: either that the Catholic gentry were wealthier than the members of their class, as a whole; or that King under-estimated the general level of incomes. If the first explanation is the correct one, the conclusion is that, since the Catholic gentry were at least 5 per cent of the whole, in numbers, the Catholics must have owned more than 5 per cent of the land of the country. On the other hand, if King under-estimated the general level of incomes, the calculation of 5 per cent for Catholic land values remains unimpaired.

The view that the term "gentleman" is used in the same sense in Gregory King's statistics and in the Catholic registers of 1715-20 is borne out by the fact that the proportion between the number of (a) baronets, and (b) knights, esquires, and gentlemen is much the same in Gregory King's statistics and in the Catholic registers.

On the other hand, it is by no means certain that Berington, in 1781, included all those who would have been described as gentlemen in his estimate of "150 gentlemen of landed property", for he writes that "the greatest part have not, on an average, more than £1000 a year in landed property". This figure is much higher than the calculation of £400 to £500 per annum for the Catholic gentlemen of 1715-20, but the disproportion is not so great as it seems. It is well known that agricultural methods improved very rapidly in the latter half of the eighteenth century, and that the productivity of the land, and therefore the income arising from it, was greatly increased.

In the second place, the price level of agricultural produce was perhaps 20 per cent higher in 1781 than in 1715. It is by no means impossible that the income arising from land was twice as high in 1781 as 1715.

We have already seen that estimates of total land values rose from £12 millions in 1690 to a mean of £16 millions in or about 1750, and we may be quite certain that a further and more rapid increase in land values took place in the latter half of the eighteenth century. We cannot, however, be quite certain that the income arising from land doubled during the period 1715 to 1780. And, if the general level of income from land increased in a smaller proportion, it would follow that the average income of Catholic gentlemen in 1781 must have been less than £1000 per annum. This would lead to the conclusion that Berington only included the wealthier and more important Catholic gentlemen in his estimate, and we should be forced to admit that Berington's figure of 150 would not be properly comparable with the figure of 814 gentlemen in 1715. Such a conclusion is supported by a comparison between the ratios of the numbers of (a) baronets and (b) knights, esquires, and gentlemen at the two dates. In 1715 the Catholic baronets number 36, and the lesser gentry 766, while in 1781 the Catholic baronets are given, by Berington, as 22, and the lesser gentry as only 150. It will be observed that the proportion of baronets is relatively much higher in Berington's estimates than in the earlier figures, and it seems quite possible that Berington did not include a substantial number of the less wealthy gentry in his estimate. Deductions of this kind, however, are somewhat speculative.

To sum up, it is hardly fair to argue that the Catholic population in 1715-20 may be obtained by multiplying the 1781 returns of Catholic populations by the ratio between the number of gentlemen in 1715 and the number of gentlemen in 1781 (as given by Berington). Some smaller multiple must be adopted, since it is fairly clear that Berington's figure is too low for purposes of valid comparison. If we were to take the relative numbers of Catholic baronets at the two dates as our guide, we would

find that the Catholics in 1715-20 were only about 2½ per cent and not 5 per cent of the whole population, in spite of the fact that the Catholic gentry were quite certainly at least 5 per cent of the whole. Such a basis of calculation would lead to the conclusion that the Catholic gentry influenced, on the whole, only about one-half of their dependents.

Is this conclusion reasonable? For the period in which Berington wrote, possibly it is, but for earlier periods, probably not. In the early days of the Reformation, it was the gentry, rather than the common people, who embraced the new religion. The common people were of course, in the long run, influenced to follow their immediate social and economic superiors in matters of religion, but where the local gentleman was Catholic, the common people remained Catholic.

The decline in the influence of the Catholic gentry, if such a decline took place, must inevitably have been a very gradual process, and must certainly have been much less advanced in 1715 than 1780; still less advanced in 1680. If the Catholic gentry in 1780 only influenced one-half of their dependents in matters of religion, they may, in 1715, have influenced perhaps three-quarters, and in 1680 perhaps nine-tenths, or some such proportion. Moreover—and it is important to note the point—by 1780 the Industrial Revolution and the drift to the towns had begun, and the number of the common people who were dependent on the country gentry was relatively less than in the past. It is fair, therefore, taking everything into account, to conclude that a comparison of Berington's figures with the registers of 1715 points strongly to the view that very nearly one-twentieth of the whole population was Catholic in 1715. And the further back we go, the more certain one may be that the proportion of Catholic gentry is the index to the Catholic proportion of the population. It may be remarked, also, that, in any estimate of the political and social importance of Catholicism, the numerical strength of the gentry is the significant figure.

For periods earlier than 1680, there is less material. There certainly do not appear to be any comprehensive

lists or surveys, other than those of 1680 and 1715-20. It has been suggested that, at the commencement of the seventeenth century, about half the country was Catholic, and this seems to have been the opinion of more than one contemporary Catholic writer. But, as far as I am aware, these statements are very vaguely worded, and it is impossible to be certain whether the estimates are meant to include only professed recusants, or those of even the vaguest Catholic sympathies. The depositions of a certain Roger Grom, a seminary priest, are more precise. Father Grom was examined by the authorities in 1603, and he expressed the opinion that one-third of the English people were, at that date, open and avowed recusants. The relevant passage from Father Grom's depositions is as follows (extract from the examination of Roger Grom, the seminary priest, 22 June, 1603):

To the demand, what number of Catholicks there were in England, his answer was that he thought the third part were Catholicks. Being demanded whom he accounteth Catholicks, he saith he accounteth none for Catholicks, but such as do refrayne to come to our Church.*

Another interesting estimate is found in a letter of a certain Phillip Bennett,† addressed to the Earl of Salisbury, in 1605. This man (who may possibly have been one of Cecil's spies) seems to have been imprisoned for debt, and he writes that he had conversation with many Catholic prisoners, one of whom said that there were 300,000 Papists in England who would pay forty shillings per annum each for toleration. If the 300,000 are taken to be the heads of households (which is the natural interpretation), and if we assume an average of five persons to a family, we may calculate a Catholic population of $1\frac{1}{3}$ millions, which is about one-third of the total population at this date.

The correspondence of successive Venetian ambassadors contains numerous references to the state of Catholicism

* State Papers, Domestic, James I, Vol. 2, 15 (1).

† S. P. Dom. Jas. I, Vol. 17.

in England. The following passages refer to the numerical position :

7 July, 1604. A few days ago the men of one of the northern counties, who are *almost all* Catholics, rose and expelled the Calvinistic ministers, and insisted upon the public and solemn celebration of Mass in the church.*

8 December, 1605. I know that it has been pointed out to His Majesty that it is no wise policy, considering that the Catholics number *a half, and perhaps more* of the population, to press them so hard that they should be driven to band together and try their fortune to the ruin of one party, and of the other.

22 April, 1609. . . . the Catholics, who are numerous, as I find to my surprise, at this solemn season.

15 July, 1623. They also hope with the completion of this marriage that the Catholic rite will make great progress in that realm [England] since it is notorious that there is a countless number of Catholics there, who at present keep in the background out of fear.

On the other hand, a letter written on 7 February, 1618, speaks of the "small number of divided Catholics". Finally, for the middle of the century, we have the letter of 1655, noted above, in which the Venetian Ambassador writes : "This is certain, that, in spite of all the persecution, a fourth part of England is undoubtedly Catholic." We have also an estimate for the reign of Charles I. A book printed in 1715 contains "an important discourse concerning the state of religion in England written in French in the time of Charles I, and now first translated". The translator adds a note to the effect that it seems to have been written by some Foreign Minister at the English Court. From the context it is evident that it was written between the years 1635 and 1641. The relevant passage is the following :

Though the Catholics are not so numerous as the Church of England men and the Puritans, yet they make a considerable

* In the summer of 1605 the Catholics of Herefordshire also rose in arms and celebrated Mass publicly. They were eventually dispersed, but the incident caused the Government considerable alarm. (See, *inter alia*, correspondence of Venetian ambassador.)

part of the State, consisting of some noblemen, powerful by their riches and alliances, and a great number of the common people.

The writer does not commit himself to any precise estimate, but a Catholic proportion of a quarter or one-fifth is consistent with the context of this passage. Clearly, the Catholics must have been less than one-third, since they are expressly stated to be the weakest of the three parties, but, on the other hand, the writer evidently did not consider that they were overwhelmingly outnumbered. Had he thought that the Catholics were some fraction such as one-tenth of the nation, he would hardly have described them as forming "a considerable part of the State". The reasonable interpretation of this passage is that the Catholics were the weakest of the three parties, but not by a very great margin. One may, therefore, infer that the writer regarded the Catholics as a quarter or a fifth of the population.

Considered as evidence, the statements of foreign ambassadors are very valuable indeed, since we can be certain that they were not mere propaganda. The letters of the Venetian ambassadors were written to keep the Venetian Government informed of English political conditions, and there would be no motive whatever for conveying false information. Moreover, where the estimates of Englishmen might be influenced by emotional attachment to one party or the other, the Venetian ambassador, as a foreigner, would be more in the position of an impartial observer.

Mr. Belloc takes the view that the crisis of the Gunpowder Plot, in 1605, was the turning-point in the Catholic decline. The following extract is an interesting confirmation of this view (extract from a letter of Ben Jonson, the poet, to the Earl of Salisbury, dated 8 November, 1605):

They [the Catholics] are all so enweaved in it [i.e. the Gunpowder Plot], as it will make 500 gentlemen less of the religion, within this week.*

For the reign of Charles I, and for the year 1640 in particular, certain numerical tests can be applied. In

* S. P. Dom. Jas. I, Vol. 16, (30).

the Public Record Office, there is a document of this date which contains the names of 19 peers, to whom the King granted letters of protection against the Recusancy Laws.* One of these is a Scottish peer, which leaves 18 English peers. To this list must be added the names of the Earl of Bristol (though there is some doubt),† and Lord Cottington (who is mentioned as a Catholic in Castlemaine's *Catholique Apology*). If this list is compared with the lists of 1680 and 1715, it will be found that the later lists contain the names of seven Catholic peers, who are not mentioned in the document of 1640. In each of these seven cases, the peerages were created before 1640, and it may therefore be presumed that the seven peers, or their predecessors, were Catholics in 1640. (Of course, it is possible that one or two of these may have been converts.) Three names out of these seven appear in the *Catholique Apology*, and two more are mentioned in Dodd's *Church History*, which also states that the Earl of Kingston was a Catholic. This brings the total of Catholic peers up to 28. The total number of English peers, in 1640, was about 127 or 129. Thus, the Catholic peers were, in 1640, nearly one-quarter of the total number. In 1624 there were at least three more Catholic peers; the names are given in a list of Catholics in the *House of Lords Journal* for that year.

Among the peers to whom Charles I granted special protection was Lord St. Albans. How superficial, in many cases, was conformity to the established Church may be judged from the fact that, on taking the oaths of supremacy and allegiance in 1678, Lord St. Albans mumbled the words indistinctly, and, on the following day, was required to repeat the oaths clearly, to the satisfaction of their lordships.‡ It is well known that convicted recusants formed at all times only a fraction of those who were openly Catholic, yet between the years 1625 and 1642, about 750 Catholic gentlemen were so convicted.§ This is clearly a large number, and the question at once arises: what proportion of the whole

* S. P. Dom. Chas. I, Vol. 445.

† His son (the second Earl of Bristol) and grandson (third Earl) were both convicted as recusants in 1663. (Brit. Mus. Add. MS. 20, 739.)

‡ Cobbett, *Parliamentary History*. § S. P. Dom. Chas. I, Vol. 495.

body of the Catholic gentry does it represent? What is the ratio between the number of convicted recusants and the total number of Catholic gentlemen? No final answer can be given, but there are two methods of establishing such a ratio which give results, which, if not identical, are at least compatible with one another. The Treasury records of 1715-20 contain, in addition to the figures already quoted, the total of "Two-thirds of the estates of recusants convict", which amounts to a little over £60,000. The full value of the estates of convicted recusants must therefore, in 1715, have amounted to about £90,000. It is not clear whether this figure represents the full annual value of these estates, or only the annual rentals of lands let to tenants. It has been shown that the registered rentals of all Catholic estates at this period amounted to £413,000, and that the full annual value may have been as much as twice this figure. The estates of convicted recusants were therefore, at the lowest, one-ninth, and at the highest not much more than one-fifth, of all the Catholic estates. The conclusion is that, at this date, probably only about one Catholic gentleman in seven was a convicted recusant.

The second method of calculation gives a somewhat similar result. The *Catholique Apology*, ascribed to the Earl of Castlemaine, contains the names of about 200 Catholic gentlemen who lost their lives during the Civil War. A comparison of this list with the names of the 750 Catholic gentlemen convicted as recusants between 1625 and 1642 is somewhat difficult, because the *Catholique Apology* does not give, in every case, the Christian name of the individual. It is, however, clear that, of 197 names in the *Catholique Apology*, not more than 26, at the highest estimate, appear in the list of 750 convicted recusants. Some allowance must, of course, be made for persons who may have been convicted as recusants during the Civil War, but this is offset by the fact that we cannot even be certain of as many as 26 names. Now, 26 is a little less than one-seventh of 197, and it therefore seems that, of the Catholic gentlemen who fell during the Civil War, only about one in seven was a convicted recusant. The similarity of the results yielded by the

two methods of calculation is a strong argument in favour of the view that only about one-seventh of the Catholic gentry were actually convicted recusants.

It remains to inquire how many of the 750 gentlemen convicted between 1625 and 1642 were alive at the latter date. There are no means of discovering this, but, assuming :

(1) That an equal number of recusants were convicted in each of the seventeen years, and

(2) That recusants, at the time of conviction, included persons of all ages, young, middle-aged, and elderly, evenly spread, and

(3) That the average age at death was 55 : then in 1642 about 550 out of the 750 would have been alive. This is, of course, only a guess, but it is probably sufficiently correct for the present purpose.

Now, assuming the number of convicted recusant gentlemen in 1642 to have been about 550, and assuming the convicted recusants to be about one-seventh of the Catholic gentry, then the total number of Catholic gentlemen in 1642 would be 3850, which, on the basis of King's statistics, is about one-quarter of the gentry as a whole.

It may very reasonably be objected that this calculation is very speculative and uncertain, but the point is that the result tallies very closely with the other calculations and estimates for the same period which have already been noted.

The view that about a quarter or a fifth of the gentry were Catholic in the time of Charles I is thus supported by no less than six converging lines of evidence, viz. :

(1) The fact that between a quarter and a fifth of the peers were Catholic.

(2) The fact that more than two-fifths of the Royalist officers killed during the Civil War were Catholics.

(3) The calculation (based on the number of convicted recusants) that nearly a quarter of the gentry were Catholic.

(4) The statement of the Venetian ambassador in 1655 that a fourth of England was Catholic.

(5) The opinion of Sarmiento, the Spanish ambassador, that about a quarter of England was Catholic.*

(6) The statement of an unknown writer (possibly the French minister at the English Court) that the "Catholics make a considerable part of the State", the context leading to the inference that the Catholics were some such proportion as one-fifth.

It is interesting to note that, at the opening of the first Parliament of Charles I, in 1626, it is recorded† that "all the Recusant Lords that were at the coronation did ride to the Church with the rest, but when they came there, they all went away and heard not the sermon". Such a public demonstration is a measure of the strength of the Catholic body, at this time.

In view of the mass of evidence which shows that the numerical strength of Catholicism under the Stuarts was much greater than has been supposed, it is interesting to inquire into the origins of the very low estimates which were mentioned earlier in this paper. Macaulay, in his history, tells us that under James II the Catholics were one-fiftieth of the population, but he gives no authority for this statement. Nor is there, to my knowledge, any contemporary estimate of that order of magnitude. There are higher estimates, and there are lower estimates, but I can find no reference to a proportion of one in fifty. The origin of Macaulay's statement, however, is possibly to be found in Samuel Ayscough's catalogue of the Additional Manuscripts in the British Museum. Reference has been made above to Document 4459 (15), entitled *The Present State of Popery in England*, in which the writer refers to an investigation made under James II, from which it appeared that the number of Catholics was about 13,000. (The writer did not regard this figure as correct.) In Ayscough's catalogue there appears the following note: "4459 (15). *The Present State of Popery* (1688). (Number in England 102,950.)" Now, 102,950 is almost exactly one-fiftieth of the population at that date, and, since Ayscough's catalogue was in existence in Macaulay's time, it is very

* Albion: *Charles I and the Court of Rome*.

† *Hist. Man. Com.*, Duke of Buccleuch's MSS.

possible that this is the origin of his estimate. But the point to notice is that an elementary mistake had been made in the compilation of the catalogue. The document does *not* state that the number of Catholics was 102,950. The writer gives an account of the annual sums spent by Catholics in maintaining priests, convents, seminaries, etc., and the total annual expenditure is given as £102,950. The figure, therefore, is a monetary statement, and not an estimate of population.

Three of the estimates which have been noted in this article are, for all practical purposes, identical, and may therefore be considered together. First, we have Petty's estimate of 25,000 (c. 1690). Secondly, the reference to an account prepared at the beginning of the reign of William III, from which it appeared that there were "179 Conformists to one Papist, besides Dissenters"; if we take this to mean a Catholic proportion of one in 210 or 220 we again arrive at 25,000. Thirdly, we have the document dated 1708, which places the Catholic population at 26,191. These three estimates are substantially the same, and may possibly have a common origin.

As to their validity, it is recorded that William III caused the account to be prepared "to gratify the fears of those about him, who were continually possessing him with the dangers of Popery". Here at once we see a clear motive for under-statement. Secondly, we have an indirect criticism of these figures in the speech* of the Bishop of Chester in the House of Lords in 1781. The document of 1708 shows the number of Catholics in each ecclesiastical diocese, and the number for the diocese of Chester is given as 9125. The Bishop of Chester in 1781 referred to a calculation of the Catholics in the diocese, made in the year 1717, from which it appeared that the number was 10,308. The figures are sufficiently close for our purpose. The Bishop has left some notes of his speech on the matter, which are given in Hansard, and the following passage refers to the calculation of 1717:

I undertook to prove that his [Lord Ferrers's] statement of the number of Catholics in the diocese of Chester in the year 1717

* Hansard, 19 March, 1781.

was extremely erroneous, having been taken only from very inaccurate returns to Bishop Gaskell's visitational enquiries, and not from any parliamentary survey, which alone could be depended upon; that two such surveys had lately been taken of the number of Papists in England and Wales, one in 1767, the other in 1780.

And again :

Though he had every reason to depend upon that calculation which was made in 1767, and also upon that subsequently formed in 1780, yet he had various motives for disputing the accuracy or authenticity of the first estimation, made in 1717, which he believed to be very vague and uncertain. . . . The Catholics were a decreasing rather than an increasing quantity.

The Bishop's arguments were sufficiently convincing to induce Lord Ferrers to withdraw a motion which the Bishop of Chester opposed.

In the light of this criticism, and of the positive evidence to the contrary, the very low estimates of Catholic numbers may safely be disregarded.

Before concluding this survey, one interesting sidelight must be noted. By comparing the Catholic rentals for each county (according to the registrations of 1715-20) with the Land Tax Assessments,* it is possible to establish the percentage of Catholics in each county. The Land Tax, it must be admitted, was levied somewhat unequally, but the broad lines of the distribution are clear. The following table shows the Catholic percentages :

per cent				per cent			
Lancashire	35	Shropshire	8
Durham and				Sussex	8
Northumberland	20	Derby	8
Stafford	20	Worcester	8
Cumberland and				Oxford	8
Westmorland	18	Hereford	7
Yorkshire	15	Leicester	7
Nottingham	11	Lincoln	7
Monmouth	11	Northampton and			
Warwick	10	Rutland	7

* *House of Commons Journal*, 29 Feb., 1700.

Catholic Population in Penal Times 81

	per cent		per cent
Cheshire	5	Surrey	2
Berkshire	4	London, Middlesex, and	
Norfolk	4	Westminster	2
Hampshire	4	Somerset	1
Gloucester	4	Huntingdon	1
Suffolk	4	Bedford	Less than 1
Dorset	4	Cambridge	Less than 1
Bucks	3	Cornwall	Less than 1
Wiltshire	3	Devon	Less than 1
Essex	3	Hertford	Less than 1
Kent	2	Wales	4½

It is rather surprising to find Stafford with the highest percentage, apart from Lancashire, but this is confirmed by Father Berington's statement in 1781. He writes: "After London, by far the greatest number is in Lancashire. In Staffordshire are a good many, and in the northern counties of York, Durham, and Northumberland." It is a small point, but interesting in that it shows the internal consistency of the evidence. The geographical distribution of Catholics provides an illuminating commentary on political history. The table given above shows that, in twenty counties, the Catholic proportion is above the average of 5 per cent, while, in the remaining twenty, it is below it. With the single exception of Sussex, all the counties with a proportion above the average lie to the north of a line drawn from the Bristol Channel to the Wash, while all the counties with less than the average percentage lie, without exception, south of this line. The line is not absolutely regular, since Gloucester lies on the southern but Oxford on the northern side. But, with the exception of Sussex, the line of cleavage divides the country into two compact areas. The Catholic percentage in the counties to the north of the line is 10.97, while in the counties to the south it is only 2.69. Catholics were therefore more than four times as strong in the northern and western half than they were in the southern and eastern half of the country. Moreover, the line of demarcation is sharp. There is no gradual shading-off. The counties lying immediately on the northern side of the line are Monmouth, Hereford,

Worcester, Warwick, Oxford, Northampton, and Lincoln. The adjacent counties on the southern side are Gloucester, Wiltshire, Berkshire, Buckingham, Bedford, Huntingdon, Cambridge, and Norfolk. In the first group of counties, the Catholic percentage in 1715-20 is 7.5; but in the neighbouring group, south of the line from the Bristol Channel to the Wash, it is only 3.1. There is an even sharper contrast between Bedford, Huntingdon, and Cambridge, on the one hand, where the Catholic proportion is less than 1 per cent, and, on the other hand, their immediate neighbours, Northampton, Rutland, and Lincoln, where the Catholic proportion is 7 per cent. The line from the Bristol Channel to the Wash is therefore no vague or arbitrary boundary, but represents a clear and definite cleavage.*

It is well known that in the Civil War of the seventeenth century, the Catholics were Royalists to a man, and the political significance of this line of cleavage is therefore apparent. The line from the Bristol Channel to the Wash is roughly the boundary between the Royalist and Parliamentary spheres of influence at the outbreak of the Civil War in 1642. Early in the war, it is true, the counties of Gloucester, Somerset, Devon, and Cornwall, which were largely Royalist in sympathy, were occupied by the Royalist forces, but it is impossible to escape the conclusion that the geographical divisions of the Civil War were determined mainly, if not almost entirely, by the geographical distribution of Catholics. It must be remembered that in 1642 the Catholics were very much more numerous than they were in 1720. It has been shown that there are indications that the Catholics in 1642 were about 20 per cent of the population, as against 5 per cent in 1720. If it also assumed that the relative proportions north and south of the line from the Bristol Channel to the Wash were the same in 1642 as in 1720, then on the northern side of the boundary the Catholics must have been, in 1642, no less than 44 per cent

* A study of the list of 32 persons (other than noblemen) to whom Charles I granted letters of protection against the Recusancy laws shows that all the persons named lived in southern or south midland counties. A possible inference is that the Recusancy laws were less effectively enforced in the north.

of the population, while on the southern side they would have been less than 11 per cent. It is therefore possible that the area controlled by the King in 1642 was nearly half Catholic, while the area controlled by the Parliament was 90 per cent Protestant. This, in itself, would be amply sufficient to explain the geography of the Civil War. Moreover, it would show that the Puritan diatribes against the "Papist Army" of Charles I did not exaggerate the Catholic influence in that army quite so wildly as has been commonly supposed.

BRIAN MAGEE.

Note.—Since writing the first part of this article I have examined the returns of the replies to the three questions regarding the repeal of the Penal Laws, addressed by James II to the Justices of the Peace. (See *Penal Laws and Test Act*, Sir George Duckett, 1882.) These returns reveal the names of at least five Catholic baronets of which I was not previously aware. The addition of these names brings the number of Catholic baronets at this period to well over 10 per cent. The proportion may be taken as one in nine.—B. M.

SHAKESPEARE AND THE ELIZABETHAN STATUTES

THE omission of any real historical background from modern portraits of Shakespeare, and the failure to apply reasoned historical criticism to the study of his epoch, have led to a curious paradox: the general reader is far more ignorant concerning the life of the greatest dramatic writer of any age than were the men and women under Queen Anne or the Georges. It is difficult indeed for those who, for upwards of five generations, have enjoyed complete liberty of conscience and seen absolute tolerance practised towards every religious confession, to realize how entirely each subject's life differed in Shakespeare's England from anything which we now conceive. The most cursory glance at the series of edicts, injunctions, and proclamations issued by royal authority and rigorously enforced throughout Elizabeth's long reign suffices to show that the poet lived under a political system of terror and fiscal extortion which must be taken into account if we would comprehend a large portion of those writings, in which the bitter cry for justice and freedom sounds so often, and so loud. It is impossible to understand the conditions of civil life throughout the midland shires if we forget that two-thirds of the Queen's subjects dwelt in a state of virtual slavery after the passage, in 1559, of the Act of Supremacy and its corollary, the Act of Uniformity.

The circumstances of Shakespeare's education, marriage, and flight from Stratford, his rôle in the Irish Campaign and Essex Conspiracy, must be examined in connexion with simultaneous events occurring throughout England, not judged by the standards which today govern Great Britain, France, and the United States.

The first Parliament held after Elizabeth's accession passed two Acts which completely altered the conditions of civil life. By the first it was decreed that any person who after June of the same year should "by writing, preaching, or printing, word, deed, or act, uphold the

spiritual authority of a foreign potentate, should, together with his aiders, procurers, or counsellors, be subject to the forfeiture of his goods and a year's imprisonment". At a second offence the penalty called *praemunire* or misprision was enforced and, after a third disavowal of spiritual allegiance to the Queen only, the culprit was liable to the full penalties of high treason. A test oath was demanded from all ecclesiastics. This oath, extended later to those who held public office, consisted in the solemn declaration that "the Queen's highness is the only supreme governor of this realm in all spiritual and ecclesiastical things as well as temporal". Upon those who practised any form of worship not in conformity with the revised Anglican prayer-book the same punishment was imposed as by the Act of Supremacy. The passage of these measures brought three new words into the language. Persons who declared the Pope head of the Catholic Church and who refused to swear an oath acknowledging the Queen's spiritual authority were termed *Papists*; those who did not regularly attend the Protestant Church as by law established were *Recusants*; and the large class of spies and informers, recruited by Richard Topcliffe, chief of Walsingham's intelligence service and placed at the disposition of local authorities, were termed *Pursuivants*.

During the first decade after the Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity had been passed, arrests—contrary to expectation—were not followed by any capital punishments. People who had been severely frightened began to breathe freely until 1561, when the first sanguinary step was taken. An old priest, Thomas Woodhouse, was committed to the Fleet prison, and another, Cuthbert Mayne, was indicted at the same time for "having brought into the kingdom a vain and superstitious thing called an *Agnus Dei* blessed by the Bishop of Rome and having publicly said Mass and administered the Lord's Supper contrary to the statutes of our Sovereign Lady Elizabeth and against her peace and crown". After eleven years in prison, during which time public sentiment was prepared for the new policy, both men were executed for high treason; and hangings, with their

horrible accompaniment of dismemberment, "at the Queen's pleasure", became the order of the day.

York, Winchester, Durham, and London saw some of the best minds of England—from Thomas Plumtree, and Dr. Storey of Oxford to Edmund Campion and Robert Southwell—suffer, with humbler souls, the extreme penalty of the law; so that when Good Queen Bess finally handed in her account in 1603, she could point to a formidable list of priests, laymen, and even gentlewomen who had met a felon's or traitor's death under the Statutes which bear her name. Margaret Ward, guilty of the charitable offence of carrying food to an imprisoned priest—for in those days captives who had nothing in their purse were obliged to rely on private charity in order to eat—was hanged at Tyburn. Mrs. Swithin Wells and Mrs. Wiseman died under sentence. Anne Line was hanged for harbouring; but Margaret Clitherow, who refused to plead in court, saying that she would never make twelve jurymen party to her death, was subjected to the terrible *Peine forte et dure*—placed upon a sharp stone and under immense weights until, after fifteen minutes, she succumbed.

A merry England it was under Good Queen Bess, although British historians and biographers of Shakespeare seem to have forgotten it!

If we examine the ever increasing severity of the application of anti-recusant legislation year by year and consider what bearing each new Act, proclamation, or injunction "given by Her Majesty" necessarily had on the family life of the Shakespeares and their neighbours, it is easy to explain many of the troubles into which their son was plunged—from deer-stealing episode to marriage problem; from the choice of a Catholic patron in London to connexion with the Essex Conspiracy, whose leaders were pledged with King James to accord religious freedom to both Catholics and Puritans.

In 1568 Cardinal Allen founded an English College at Douay for the education of exiled Catholics and ordination of a new clergy. In 1570 a Papal Bull was launched against the Queen by Pius V, and Elizabeth's Government immediately responded by making it high

treason to introduce a Papal Bull into England or stigmatize her as a heretic (13 Eliz., cc. 1, 2). Eight executions followed this measure and a more drastic legislation was enacted. The Act of Persuasions (23 Eliz., c. 1) made the mere act of "reconciling or being reconciled" to the Romish religion a treasonable offence. In 1579 a number of exiled priests headed by John Parsons and Edmund Campion set out for England to minister to their abandoned flocks. Among many books of devotion they carried certain political pamphlets, notably Leicester's *Republic*, which drove the Queen's favourite into a towering passion. Campion had years before, when newly ordained, pronounced the funeral oration of Amy Robsart and thrown suspicion of foul play upon her consort. He faced almost certain death in coming to England, for the price set on his head was tempting. It appealed to a certain Eliot, and Campion was hanged at Tyburn with Ralph Sherwin and Alexander Briant, while eight of their comrades met death in the shires. It was in the heat of this slaughter that William Shakespeare was married and forced by the diocesan authorities to guarantee the immense sum of forty pounds to keep officers and bishop "blameless" for having issued a licence to legalize an irregular ceremony.

Warwickshire was an old Catholic stronghold, where the majority set aside the new prayer-book and continued doggedly much as before. Even those who did not adhere to the ancient faith had little or no sympathy for the newly established Church of England. Old men shook their heads, deeming that it was unlawful for a woman to be a "spiritual governor".

The Earl of Leicester, as Lieutenant of the Shire, complained how the spiritual authority of the Sovereign was being tampered with. "Since Queen Mary's time the Papists were never in that jolity they be in at present in this country." In 1579 Bishop Whitgift apologized to Burleigh for his inability to maintain strong discipline in the diocese, saying: "Two kinds of men delight to molest and trouble; the contentious Protestant and the obstinate Papist." Even a bishop could not always prevent country-folk from obeying their old Catholic pastors.

Bullingham often discreetly winked at abuses, notably at the time when Francis Throckmorton of Coughton Court took to wife Anne Sutton and obtained episcopal licence to have the ceremony performed "in any church, chapel or oratory of the diocese and by any fit priest". This was in 1571, when Hugh Hall was chaplain to Sir John Throckmorton. The episcopal consent is recorded on Bishop Bullingham's Register, No. XXXII, Folio 3B. There is little doubt that Hall was the celebrant.

Joseph William Gray, alone among commentators, has given the question of Shakespeare's marriage full and conscientious study, but his book, *Shakespeare's Marriage and Flight from Stratford*, has long been out of print, so that his dictum in reference to the Throckmorton ceremony is passed over by modern critics. "I have not succeeded", he writes, "in finding a record of this marriage, which may have been first solemnized according to the rites of the old faith." Mrs. Carmichael Stopes is more categorical in her assertion that *all* entries where neither church nor celebrant is specifically mentioned indicate that the Catholic ritual was employed. She makes no doubt that the sole mystery of Shakespeare's marriage was that a priest officiated. I fully concur in her opinion, but I think that I can produce stronger reasons for this belief.

The Roman rite was commonly practised until 1582 by those who could afford to pay fines. Indeed, certain families "compounded" with the authorities for a lump sum per annum—usually forty pounds—and no questions asked. Sir Thomas Gerard, for instance, had been twice in the Tower when he was summoned to the Master of the Rolls to "compound for his recusancy" by the free offer of a sum to be paid yearly to the Queen. This offer, signed with his own hand, is now in the Public Record Office. In it "he most humbly submitteth himself to Her Majesty's pleasure but is not able to offer any great sums, offering his person to serve Her Highness in any place in the world. And if he shall not be admitted thereto, then he offereth with very good will thirty pounds a year which is a fourth part of the small portion remaining now left to maintain himself and his poor

Shakespeare and the Elizabethan Statutes 89

children." Evidently the amount was not sufficient, for the name of his wife, Dame Elisabeth Gerard, heads the list of thirty-three recusants "sometime resident about London and Middlesex but now dispersed into other countries".

Sir Thomas Lucy gives a picture of what was constantly happening when he complained that eleven priests "lurking" in the shire were celebrating marriages and baptizing children. Listed for indictment over his signature is "One Hales a very old Massing priest who married John Wyse, Gentleman, to his last wife, and married Thomas Higginson of Burkswell to his wife now living [it is vehemently to be supposed with Masses] and is commonly resorted to at Mrs. Brookesby's in Tamworth and many other places in the country of Warwick. This Hales hath christened divers children in the Popish order." The fact that such baptisms and marriages as Sir Thomas Lucy complained of eventually figured on the parish records and diocesan registers indicates that there was frequent collusion between local authorities and the "Massing priests" still active in the shire, and that upon payment of a small fee over and above the regular charge for a licence with banns (from four to six shillings at most) the bishop's sanction could be obtained.

The price paid by William Shakespeare, however, was by no means small. This should be taken into consideration in any fair examination of the problem: when, where, and by whom his union with Anne Hathaway was celebrated.* The normal procedure of a youth whose parents were old-fashioned Catholics has been shown by Shakespeare himself. This was to crave a blessing on his nuptials from a friendly priest of the neighbourhood. Romeo and Juliet, Orlando and Rosalind, Sebastian and Olivia, Claudio and Hero either publicly or privately were united by a priest. And each clerical portrait is drawn with an astonishingly sympathetic touch.

Recollect that William was only nineteen. Conse-

* When official recognition of his marriage was given at Worcester, a bond of forty pounds "to keep blameless our Father in God Lord John, Bishop of Worcester or his officers" was exacted from the youthful bridegroom.

quently the then vicar of the parish of Holy Trinity, Sir William Gilbard, *alias* Higgs, must have been obliged to conform to the law and refuse to read the service over a minor, even if he was ever invited so to do. At that time all the priests known to the Shakespeare family were under ban. Such a legal point as this could hardly alarm those who were already outside the law, and it only remained to search for the individual most likely to have been selected for this office. Beside the many names obligingly furnished by Sir Thomas Lucy himself, there was one "Massing priest" near Stratford toward whom my attention was early called, principally from the fact that shortly after Shakespeare's marriage Sir Thomas Lucy had been instrumental in getting him hanged. This was a certain Hugh Hall of Idlicote—a village some four miles from Stratford—a relative of whom afterwards married Susanna Shakespeare. Hugh Hall had resided in the district for upwards of thirteen years, and, beside his spiritual calling, was a remarkable hand at orchard-planting and master of the art of designing the formal "knotted gardens", in which the poet evidently rejoiced. As resident chaplain in the family of Edward Arden of Park Hall, whose daughter Margaret he had married to John Sommerville, "Sir Hugh" was undoubtedly the priest most likely to be resorted to by the son of Mary Arden of Wilmcote.

A very old tradition affirms that Shakespeare's marriage to Anne Hathaway took place at Luddington, which was the parish of Temple Grafton where Anne, upon quitting Shottery after her father's death, resided. The registers survived until the eighteenth century, when the church was destroyed by fire. But I shall only present the facts of which documentary evidence still exists. On the 27th day of November, 1582, through what means we know not, William Shakespeare obtained the paper which was necessary to legalize his marriage with Anne Hathaway. This fact remains established on Bishop Whitgift's Register, for the inhabitants of Stratford were under the jurisdiction of the Worcester See. But the very next day another and more peculiar paper was endorsed at Worcester, where the young bridegroom

Shakespeare and the Elizabethan Statutes 91

had been summoned to give bond for forty pounds guaranteed by Yeomen Sandals and Richardson, dwellers on the Hathaway estate.

After enumerating in Latin the usual "letts and hindrances" to a marriage without the requisite reading of banns, the document specifies in plain English that

Said William do upon his own proper cost and expense, defend and save harmless the right reverend Father in God Lord John, Bishop of Worcester, and his officers for licencing them, the said Anne and William, to be married together.

No attempt to furnish any historical reason for the peculiar drafting of this bond has ever been advanced. Biographers and commentators have contented themselves with the suggestion that as the marriage licence issued by Bishop Whitgift was dated a little less than seven months before the birth of Susanna Shakespeare, the bond was drawn up to protect the diocesan authority from possible reprisals from the family either of William or his bride. This explanation is exceedingly shallow; even were it admissible that the marriage had been hastily contrived to safeguard Anne's reputation, that would not explain why this bond was drawn up "to defend and save the Bishop harmless" in the matter. The size of the sum indicates that the guarantee was taken, not against the possible dissatisfaction of a yeoman's family, but as a safeguard against more serious reprisals. In short, I believe that something had occurred to frighten Lord John, Bishop of Worcester, lest the Crown itself should take up the matter and reproach the episcopal authority for having once more covered, by an official sanction, yet another ceremony not in accordance with the Elizabethan Statutes.

It remains to seek in the official archives for the trace of some event which might cause Bishop Whitgift anxiety and bring him into reproach. Up to that time such laxity as his was common enough in Warwickshire. Had anything happened specially to excite the Queen's Government in November 1582? It had.

Certain events, then recent, may furnish light on the

matter; and one particular case, here recalled for the first time, should, I think, figure in evidence. Since the Act of Persuasions had made it high treason to "reconcile or be reconciled to the Romish religion", nineteen new executions of priests had taken place—ten at Tyburn and nine in the shires; but I find special cause for the bishop's anxiety in the hanging at York, of Father James Thomson. A contemporary account of this event is given in the *Douay Dossier* published by Bishop Challoner in 1742.* He suffered at York, 28 November, 1582. This was the very day that the bond was demanded from young Shakespeare; but news of the priest's condemnation had already reached Worcester. Father Thomson had even been exhibited, loaded with double chains, three weeks previously, and sentence was passed upon him on 25 November. This was not calculated to reassure the Bishop of Worcester when he heard of it.

There is reason to suppose that he worried a good deal over the affair and it is noteworthy that this is the last recorded case of an "irregular marriage" when only forty pounds was asked for such a bond as was demanded from Shakespeare. Immediately thereafter the price was raised to one hundred pounds. Danger was in the air, and even a bishop might well tremble. Fifty more capital executions among "Papists" followed in rapid succession and many civilians as well as priests were counted in the number. Among the former was Edward Arden's family; among the latter Hugh Hall, the secular priest who had been "harboured" at the Throckmortons' and the Ardens'.

* It concludes with the words: "Mr. James Thompson was born and brought up in Yorkshire, from thence he went over to the College lately translated from Doway to Rheims where he was made priest and sent back to England in 1581. He was apprehended in the city of York in the house of Mr. Branton then prisoner for his conscience in the Kidecote. . . . Being examined by the council they asked him whether the cause of his returning into England was not to reconcile the Queen's subjects to the Church of Rome, he answered 'I will tell you ingenuously that I returned in order to do some service to my country.' They asked how many and what persons he had reconciled. He desired to be excused from answering a question by which he might bring others into danger. Then they asked whether he acknowledged the Queen's Majesty for the supreme head of the Church. He answered that he did not acknowledge her for such. 'Very well' said they, 'you need say no more, you have said enough.' He answered 'Blessed be God'."

Shakespeare and the Elizabethan Statutes 93

The tragic story is told in the report sent down to the Privy Council from Sir Thomas Lucy. It is drawn up by clerk Thomas Wilkes and dated from Charlecote House, 7 November, 1583. To facilitate the reading of this document I have modernized the spelling :

. . . In the search of Hall's house at Idlicote there was nothing found by book, paper or otherwise that might render him suspected. He himself is at London lodging at the Bell Carter Lanen [meaning the Bell and Carter Inn, Fetter Lane]. So he could not be examined. Howbeit, all other diligence was used to find his books, but nothing could be discovered through those of his house where there lodgeth the mother of Somerville a creature almost past sense and memory in respect of sickness.

Somerville's determination to be confessed by Hall the priest and to receive the Sacrament hath been and is an ordinary thing before attempting treasons, as we find by the history of King John poisoned by a monk and of late by the report published in print where the Spaniard was confessed by a friar and received the Sacrament before he attempted to murder the Prince of Orange.

The *Agnus Dei* found upon him was given him—it may be supposed—to defend him from the danger which might ensue had he attempted his wicked enterprise, for that I know to be a superstition, opinion and ceremony among the Papists.

His acquaintance and society with Hall the priest, being noted as he is for a most dangerous practiser a conveyer of intelligence to all the Capital Papists in these parts, as resorted unto them under the cloak of a gardener he converteth reconcileth confesseth saith Mass etc. and is the most likely to have persuaded this wretched traitor to attempt her Majesty's destruction.

This is the only evidence brought forward against Edward Arden and Hugh Hall, but five men were condemned on this report and Mary Arden sentenced to be burned. No sooner was Arden hanged than Francis Throckmorton was also sent down to the Tower, where, under torture, both he and the priest were questioned. The examination of Hugh Hall was taken by Thomas Wilkes and Thomas Norton on the last day of December, 1583, and may be found entire among the Domestic State Papers of Elizabeth, 164, 177. The gist is given below :

. . . For reconciling says that he has no authority so to do, for he thinks that it requires episcopal sanction . . . hath only heard confessions but of such who were in the Catholic Church already. . . . He hath had no familiarity with Francis Throckmorton these seven or eight years and doth not remember to have seen him these four or five years. With Mr. John Talbot, Sir John Throckmorton, Lord Windesor, Mr. Sheldon he hath most commonly conversed and sometimes said mass, but held no conference of state these thirteen years past, only of religion; with Sir Thomas Cornwallis and Sir Thomas Kidson he held no conference but of orchards and gardens.

In Warwickshire he hath not conversed with other than Edward Arden but denies that he was present at any marriage with a mass. All this he sayeth to be true, with refusal of her Majesty's mercy if he say not true. . . .

A picture of Throckmorton, sitting despairingly beside the rack where pain had extorted from him an avowal that he had carried letters to Mary Queen of Scots, is given in the State Papers.

I have failed in my faith and in my honor. I have born false witness against her whom I love better than all the world. I care not now, how soon you hang me.

He was hanged in July 1584, but the priest, Hugh Hall, was never again heard of, dead or alive. This was apt to be the case with those who, instead of confessing, died on the rack in Walsingham's torture-chamber. Perhaps, after all, William Shakespeare had a lucky escape after having been "often beaten, sometimes thrown into prison, and at length forced to fly his native country" by Sir Thomas Lucy.

Terror reigned throughout the shire, and these hangings did not facilitate life for the relatives of declared traitors. In 1586 John Shakespeare's old comrades at the Council Board nominated Richard Court to take his place, alleging that Mr. Shakespeare omitted to present himself when sessions were called and had done so for a long time past. No plausible reason has yet been offered to explain why a man who, during thirteen years' term of office as Chamberlain Bailiff and then Alderman,

never slack in his attendance at the Halls, should suddenly have entirely ceased to appear officially. The fact which underlay such negligence is self-evident. As a functionary John Shakespeare might at any moment be required to subscribe to the test-oath, or openly refuse it, but as a private citizen he might hope to remain unmolested unless directly denounced. Two credible witnesses were required to prove that a man or woman had been present at Mass, or "harboured" a priest. Non-attendance at the parish church, although heavily fined, was not then classed as a penal offence.

Notwithstanding this precaution, the ex-bailiff got into trouble in 1587, for he produced a habeas corpus at that date, and shortly afterwards his name was placed on the list of political suspects drawn by Sir Thomas Lucy and the Warwickshire Commissioners and repeated in 1592. From that time on the peril of his situation increased, for a new law put a premium on denunciation. It was called: "An act for the better discovery of wicked and seditious persons calling themselves Catholics, but being rebellious and traitorous subjects" (35 Eliz., c. 2). Fifty-two new executions followed, and once more Warwickshire was a prey to the fanatical zeal of Sir Thomas Lucy's commission.

In April 1593 we read how the house of Thomas Throckmorton in Coughton Court was searched:

Where Mrs. Arden, wife of Arden the traitor doth dwell at this present it would seem by your letter to Mr. Topcliffe there was resistance offered at such time as you did search the house; and that they of the household did not carry themselves with that dutiful course and obedience they ought, and that divers superstitious things and furniture for Mass was there found. And it was confessed that a Seminary priest was harboured there who was conveyed out of the way and lieth in a secret place.

We have thought good to require of you to commit to prison the said Mrs. Arden with the rest of her servants to be proceeded with according to the qualities of their offence which we refer to your discretion.

In London, as in the shires, Walsingham's sergeant had become a "living fear". The *Comedy of Errors*

furnishes a striking portrait of Walsingham's buff-coated pursuivant, who lurked in alley-ways, stole up from behind and clapped his victim on the shoulder, or mounted guard at fords and ferries to apprehend the unwary recusant.

A fiend, a fury pitiless and rough,
A wolf, nay worse, a fellow all in buff,
A hound that runs counter and yet draws dryfoot well ;
One that before judgment carries poor souls to hell.

Three mentions are made by Shakespeare of the notorious dungeon in Newgate known as *Limbo* where the condemned were thrust to await execution :

As far from help as Limbo is from bliss. (*Titus Andronicus*, III, i.)

A tartar Limbo worse than hell. (*Comedy of Errors*, IV, ii.)
I have some o' 'em in *Limbo Patrum* and they are like to dance* these three days. (*Henry VIII*, V, iii.)

Whether William Shakespeare had personal reasons to fear the "man in buff" is a question too complicated to discuss in so brief an article. But it would have been difficult for a man of generous nature to behold the punishment inflicted upon his own kith and kin and sit tamely down under the Elizabethan Statutes. According to Bacon, the performance of *Richard II*, specially presented to stir up popular indignation against the Queen (as Elizabeth herself acknowledged), remains as an indication of the poet's sympathies. But even had his proof not been accused of fomenting rebellion, the suspicion which weighed so heavily upon his kindred could not fail to cast its shadow upon the poet as "kin to Arden the traitor, cousin to John Trussell of Billesley, and son to Mary Arden of Wilmcote".†

When he arrived alone and friendless in London, powerful protection was necessary to back his energy and talent. Fortune favoured the poet and the very person best able to assure success was then the bright

* To dance at a rope's end was the cant term for hanging.

† John Trussell of Billesley edited Robert Southwell's *Triumph of Death*—and was a militant Catholic.

particular star in the world of letters. Henry Wriothesley, although a Catholic, had the power—from his coming of age until 1601, when the Traitor's Gate closed upon him also—to spread a mantle of favouring protection over friends and dependants; and all the better since as a youth of seventeen he had seen his own tutor hanged. This is a side of the question which has been neglected in reviewing the relations between the poet and his life-long patron.

Henry Wriothesley, third Earl of Southampton, to whom Shakespeare, in two beautiful dedications, solemnly consecrated all that he had done or still had to do, came into the world under the shadow of a prison. The second earl, his father, though permitted on parole to be near Lady Southampton at the time their son was born (October 1573), was either in the Tower or under close surveillance until his death in 1588, at which time his heir, a mere child, passed under the wardship of the Crown. The vigilance of Burleigh could not, however, prevent young Southampton from growing up a Catholic like the rest of his family.

From the time he came of age and was publicly known as the patron of Shakespeare's verse, "the beauty, birth and wealth and wit" were sung a hundred times by rival poets eager for his favours. "Speak of Adonis and his counterfeit is poorly imitated after you." True grandson of old Anthony Brown, Viscount Montague—whose patriotic stand, when invasion threatened, won him the right to liberty of conscience in spite of the Statutes—young Harry also inherited the fair face which made his mother famous at Court.

Thou art thy mother's glass, and she in thee
Calls back the lovely April of her prime

says Shakespeare, very truly, for the portraits of Mary Lady Southampton show an astonishing resemblance to that of her son. More than sixty paintings, miniatures, and engravings remain to witness the admiration of Southampton's contemporaries; a dozen writers beside Shakespeare sang his praise.

To him in the dedication of *Venus and Adonis* (1593), again in *The Rape of Lucrece* (1594), Shakespeare declared that he owed "all" and despaired of ever acquitting himself of his "poet's debt". And though this obligation has been generally held to have been literary and artistic (for the young earl adored the theatre and with a nod made his flatterers happy)—though he is recorded as having given Shakespeare one thousand pounds "for a purchase he had a mind to"—I am inclined to think for many reasons that among his best gifts to the poet was the assurance of safety. For in that same April 1593 which marked the high tide of persecution in Warwickshire, suddenly trouble ceased for the Shakespeares in Stratford. The poet was in a position to free his family from debt, obtain through Camden and Essex, then at the Heralds' College, the armorial blazon which was the practical stamp of gentility, and place them in the country—as is quaintly declared by Nicholas Rowe—as "people of good figure and fashion". Without powerful help in London even a magic pen could not have performed quite so potent a miracle.

C. LONGWORTH DE CHAMBRUN.

ROSARY SUNDAY

1935

We walked across the long planes of wet grass,
Still were they silvered by the morning dew,
And green and silver glistened like spun glass,
And rounded mists rose upward, steamy blue ;
October, pondering gravely, was spring new,
Fresh in its sleep on this first Sunday, still
Unopened ; only from its brooding view
Hinted a quivering, monitory chill ;
We passed the Park and climbed up over Primrose Hill.

When to St. Dominic's Priory Church we came,
We entered by the Lady Chapel door,
The vaulted oratory was aflame,
Roses and candles mingled in a store ;
Candles were lying strewn about the floor,

Still virgin ; massive three-tiered candlesticks
Like Papal crowns their pious tapers wore,
And fiery roses blazed, breathing to mix
Their incense with the murmured prayers of Catholics.

Far down the nave, we heard the priestly blessing
On sheaves of roses to be given away ;
Then a great onward movement, people pressing
To the High Altar steps, as hushed and gay
They stepped processional till they could stay
Behind the kneeling line and wait their turn ;
Along the rail hands praying, passive, lay
Until each held the rose that seemed to burn
Charity's holy lesson, teaching what we must learn.

Mystica Rosa ; O thou lovely Rose,
Budding a Rose at midnight in the cold,
Thou wiser with more love than woman knows,
Heart of all redness, spirit pure of gold,
How dost thou gather here within thy fold,
In folded hands, in they enfolded heart,
All loves of women, patient and controlled,
Weighty with stress and caring ! Here thou art
Today our Sister, and in thee we brood apart.

Brooding with thee, we mourn and we rejoice.
Our fathers, brothers, lovers, sons, for these
We turn to God and listen for His voice,
Loosing our straining in His larger ease.
Let us, Elizabeth, say our rosaries
And put one candle up for whom we will,
Pray for the men we love that they may please
Their Lord, conforming to His perfect will ;
Then take our roses home in peace across the hill.

KATHARINE GARVIN.

BISHOP BONNER AND ANGLICAN ORDERS

ALL those who have taken the trouble to make themselves familiar with the details of the controversy on Anglican Orders will have noted the part played by the alleged recognition of the Edwardine episcopal Orders of Bishop Scory, of Chichester, by that doughty champion of the Catholic side, Edmund Bonner, Bishop of London. The supposed fact is thus set forth by Denny and Lacey, in their *De Hierarchia Anglicana* :

[Alia reconciliatio], quae dignitatem episcopalem respiceret, idem Bonner per instrumentum in Registro redactum effecit. Solus ex episcopis qui juxta ritum Edwardinum consecrati erant, Johannes Scory novis rebus sese accommodavit. E sede Ciceritensi extrusus, Londinium refugit, ibique moratus, a Bonnero rehabilitationem haud frustra petiit. Namque ad Officii Pastoralis executionem restitutus, pro vero Episcopo acceptus, atque ad munera episcopalia intra dioecesim Londiniensem formaliter admissus est. Sunt qui hanc restitutionem ita interpretari conati sint, ut per eam non nisi presbyteralium functionum exercitium permitti ostendant. Sed Bonner Scoraem Episcopum vocat, deinde Confratrem . . . Necnon Scoraeo permissum est ut non modo Ministerii Ecclesiastici, quod sacerdotalia tantum officia referre posset, sed etiam Officii Pastoralis functionem exsequeretur. Hoc vero, cum praesertim cura animarum parochialis nequaquam ei commissa fuerit, nihil aliud esse potuit quam munus episcopale, quod intra dioecesim tanquam Bonneri coadjutor impenderet. (Pp. 149, 150.)

Similar statements have been made down to our own day by Anglican writers. We need only quote Mr. Morton Howard's *Epistola ad Romanos*, published in 1932 :

John Scory . . . was consecrated by Archbishop Cranmer, Ridley, Bishop of London, and John, Bishop of Bedford, on August 30th, 1551, the English ordinal being used (Cranmer's Register, f. 333), but was only rehabilitated by Bishop Bonner, without any reconsecration, on July 14th, 1554. (P. 4.)

Let us now quote the interesting document upon which this contention is based. It is to be found in Bonner's

Register, folio 347, and is thus reproduced by Denny and Lacey in *De Hierarchia Anglicana* :

Edmundus, permissione Divina, Londonensis Episcopus, universis et singulis Christifidelibus ad quos praesentes litterae nostrae testimoniales pervenerint ; ac eis praesertim quos infra scripta tangunt, seu tangere poterint quomodolibet in futurum, salutem in Auctore salutis et fidem indubiam praesentibus adhibere. Quia boni Pastoris officium tunc nos rite exsequi arbitramur, cum ad exemplar Christi, errantes oves ad caulam Domini Gregis reducimur, et Ecclesiae Christi, quae redeunti gremium non claudit, restituimus ; et quia dilectus Confrater noster Joannes nuper Cicestrensis Episcopus in Diocese et jurisdictione nostris Londonensibus ad praesens residentiam et moram faciens ; qui olim laxatis pudicitiae et castitatis habenis, contra Sacros Canones et Sanctorum Patrum decreta ad illicitas et prohibitas convolvit nuptias, se ea ratione non solum Ecclesiasticorum Sacramentorum pertractandorum omnino indignum, verum etiam a publica officii sui pastoralis functione privatum et suspensum reddens ; transactae licentiosae vitae valde poenitentem et deplorantem plurimis argumentis se declaravit, ac pro commissis poenitentiam alias per nos sibi injunctam salutarem aliquo temporis tractu in cordis sui amaritudine et animi dolore peregit, vitam hactenus degens laudabilem spemque faciens id se in posterum facturum, atque ob id ad Ecclesiasticae ac Pastoralis Functionis statum, saltem cum quodam temperamento, justitia exigente, reponendus ; hinc est quod nos praemissa ac humilem dicti Confratris nostri petitionem pro reconciliatione sua habenda et obtinenda considerantes, ejus precibus favorabiliter inclinati, eundem Confratrem nostrum ad publicam Ecclesiastici Ministerii et Officii sui Pastoralis Functionem et Executionem infra Diocesim nostram Londonensem exercendam, quatenus de jure possumus et absque cujusque praejudicio, restituimus rehabilitavimus et redintegravimus, prout tenore praesentium sic restituimus rehabilitamus et redintegramus, Sacrosanctae Ecclesiae clementia et Christiana charitate id exigentibus. Vobis igitur universis et singulis supradictis praefatum Confratrem nostrum sic ut praemittitur restitutum rehabilitatum et redintegratum fuisse et esse ad omnes effectus supradictos significamus et notificamus per praesentes sigillo nostro sigillatas. Dat. in Manerio nostro de Fulham die — mensis Julii Anno Dom. 1554, et nostrae Trans. Anno 15.*

This strange document has puzzled Catholic writers

* Denny and Lacey, op. cit., p. 149. Cf. Pocock's *Burnet*, Vol. V, p. 389. The day of the month is not inserted in Bonner's Register. Denny and Lacey print "14", but Pocock's *Burnet* correctly leaves it blank.

ever since it was first made public by Burnet at the end of the seventeenth century. Estcourt* even doubts its authenticity.† Or, alternatively, he argues that Bonner had no power to reconcile a bishop, and no jurisdiction over Scory if he claimed to be a bishop, "so that Scory must himself have acknowledged the nullity of his consecration in order to enable Bonner to deal with him at all". And Estcourt argues further that "in fact the letter does no more than enable Scory to celebrate Mass in churches within the diocese of London". And lastly, "Scory had been by law in possession of the See of Chichester, as fully as Bonner had been in possession of that of London, and Bonner may therefore have given him the honorary title".

Hutton, in his *Anglican Ministry* (1879),‡ remarks that "doubts have been thrown on the authenticity of the document", argues that "Bonner in styling Scory 'Bishop' need only have employed the term in good-humoured banter, to identify a man who was presumably penitent, and who for two years had been legally styled 'Bishop of Chichester'", and thinks that "the letter merely permits Scory to say Mass within Bonner's diocese of London" and restored him "to the exercise of his Priesthood". (Scory had been ordained priest according to the Pontifical rite.) We must permit ourselves the remark that bishops are not accustomed to indulge in "good-humoured banter" when giving dispensations to priests!

Mgr. Moyes, in his learned articles on the whole controversy on Anglican Orders, in the *Tablet* for 1895 and 1897, displays obvious embarrassment at this rehabilitation of Scory. He argues that Bonner himself had not, at the time of its issue, been reconciled to the Holy See; that in no case could Bonner rightfully possess jurisdiction over another bishop; that Bonner could not even be acting by delegated powers from the Cardinal Legate for this purpose. Mgr. Moyes admits the force of the terms "confrater", and "pastoralis officii", and concludes as follows: "This act of Bonner's

* *Question of Anglican Ordinations*, pp. 38, 39.

† So did Le Quien and Hardouin, when replying to Couroyer.

‡ Note to p. 104.

seems almost ludicrously *ultra vires*. A simple bishop has no more power to rehabilitate an excommunicated fellow bishop who happens to live in his diocese than he has to involve him in excommunication. . . . That Bonner perpetrated the eccentricity of such an absolution, his Register bears witness. That he did so in the teeth of all Canon Law, past, present, and future, is equally evident. But then he was Bishop Bonner.”*

Thus Mgr. Moyes evades the issue by a somewhat ungracious remark concerning Bonner himself.

Boudinhon, Professor of Canon Law at the Institut Catholique in Paris, in his work *De la validité des Ordinations Anglicanes* (1895), deals at length with this rehabilitation of Scory. He calls attention to the fact that “aucune expression ne fait allusion à la nullité, même seulement probable, de la consecration de Scory ; on ne lui impose pas de réordination, même conditionnelle. Je sais bien que l’on a voulu interpréter la réconciliation de Scory . . . dans le sens d’une réhabilitation presbytérale, mais les raisons apportées par Estcourt sont insoutenables, et en opposition évidente avec la teneur très claire de la pièce. . . .”

But he again falls back on the fact that Bonner had not at that time been reconciled to the Holy See :

Cet évêque a donc agi, en réhabilitant Scory sans lui imposer une réordination, de sa propre initiative, et sous sa responsabilité personnelle ; cet acte n’engage pas le Cardinal légat, et ne peut servir à infirmer la pratique constante de l’Église Romaine. Que Bonner, homme pratique, mais nullement théologien (Gasquet, cité par Denny et Lacey, *De Hierarchia*, p. 168, note 1) ait regardé comme valide pour son compte la consecration de Scory, c’est bien probable, mais on ne peut rien en conclure sur l’opinion du légat et de la curie romaine.†

Of subsequent Catholic writers we will only quote Père Michel, who deals with the matter in his article on Anglican Orders in the *Dictionnaire de Théologie*. He concedes that Scory “fut réhabilité, sans aucune allusion à la nullité de sa consecration épiscopale”, but argues that this was prior to Bonner’s reconciliation with

* *Tablet*, 2 Nov., 1895.

† Pp. 71, 72.

the Holy See, and concludes: "C'est donc un acte personnel de l'évêque de Londres, n'ayant aucune valeur."^{*} Lastly, the present writer, replying to the Rev. Morton Howard,[†] urged that:

All that Bishop Bonner could possibly do was to allow him to say Mass in his diocese. He could not rehabilitate him in his episcopal character, for that would require at least archiepiscopal authority, which Bonner did not possess. True, he describes Scory as "our brother, late Bishop of Chichester", but Scory had been Bishop of Chichester in the eyes of the law, and might technically be regarded as a Bishop-elect, who receives the title of Bishop even before his Consecration.

Subsequent reflection and research compels me to modify this statement. I am now convinced of the following points:

(1) It cannot possibly be maintained that the document merely gives Scory permission to say Mass in the Diocese of London. This has indeed been maintained, not only by Catholic scholars, but also by Nicholas Pocock, who, in his review of Denny and Lacey's *De Hierarchia Anglicana*, in the *English Historical Review* for January 1895, wrote: "The authors are mistaken in supposing this rehabilitation gave Scory the power to act as a bishop. . . . It was only as a priest that he was admitted to act in the diocese of London. . . ." But this will not square with the clear terms of the document. The heading in the Register is "Testimoniale super restitutionem episcopi uxorati". The recipient is called "dilectus confrater noster". As Denny and Lacey remark:

Hujus vocabuli usum id temporis coepiscopis proprium fuisse constat, tum ex Registris ipsius Bonneri et Poli aliorumque praesulum, tum praesertim ex locutione qua Bonner Polum certiozem fecit de synodi Provincialis convocationis: "Omnes et singulos," inquit, "Confratres nostros Episcopos infra Provinciam vestram Cantuariensem constitutos citavimus." (P. 150.)

To this we may add that the documents in Bonner's Register in which he is rehabilitating ordinary married

* Vol. XI (1932), col. 1170.

† *Epistle from the Romans*, by the Rev. E. C. Messenger (a reply to the Rev. J. G. Morton Howard's *Epistola ad Romanos*), 1933, p. 11.

priests always have the term "filius noster", and never "confrater noster". Moreover, the document we are now discussing restores the recipient not only to the "publicam ecclesiastici ministerii . . . functionem et executionem", but also to that of the "pastoralis officii". Here the "pastoral office" is something distinct from the "ecclesiastical ministry", and the reference can only be to the episcopal office. In the very beginning of the document, Bonner describes his own office as that of a "bonus pastor". The document, then, is definitely the rehabilitation of a bishop.

(2) There can be no question of its genuineness. It is written down in Bonner's own Register, and is undoubtedly authentic.

(3) On the other hand, it is impossible on other grounds that Bonner could really have recognized Scory's episcopal Orders. In the series of homilies entitled *A Profitable and Necessary Doctrine** published in this same year, 1554, Bonner, or one of his chaplains writing under his name and with his approval, thus describes Anglican clergy :

The late made Ministers in the time of the Schism, in their new devised Ordination, having no authority at all given them to offer in the Mass the body and blood of our Saviour Christ . . . most pitifully beguiled the people of this realm, who, by this means, were defrauded of the most blessed body and blood of our Saviour Christ, and the most comfortable fruit thereof, and also of the sacrifice of the Mass.

He goes on to speak of "these late counterfeited ministers" who "have in so weighty a matter deceived the people", and points out "how much you ought to esteem the right priesthood, now brought home again".

And to show that these were no mere theoretical sentiments entertained by Bishop Bonner, we may point out that, long before this time, i.e. before July 1554, and long even before the Queen issued her March injunctions,

* May I be permitted to remark that it is this work of Bonner's that is authorized by Cardinal Pole and ordered to be read in churches in the Diocese of Gloucester, in 1555? It is necessary to say this, as the Abbé Constant (*Reformation in England*, p. 429) has actually suggested that the book thus authorized by Pole and ordered to be read in churches was the *King's Book* of Henry VIII, with its flat denial of Papal authority, and its heretical tendencies on other points!

in which she ordered the reordination of Edwardine clerics, Bonner had started to reordain these in his own diocese of London. One such case is particularly interesting. Robert Kynseye had been ordained Edwardine deacon on 24 August, 1552, by Bishop Ridley at Cambridge, and Edwardine priest by the same bishop at London on 21 December, 1552. He had been instituted as Vicar of Ware, Herts, on 5 August, 1552. Now the selfsame Robert Kynseye, Vicar of Ware, Herts, was ordained to the four minor Orders, subdiaconate, diaconate, and priesthood, according to the Catholic rite, in London itself, by Commission of Bishop Bonner, on 20 and 21 December, 1553.*

Now, if Bonner thus repudiated the Edwardine diaconate and priesthood, is it possible that he would recognize the rite for the episcopate?

Further, there is definite proof that he did *not* recognize the rite for the episcopate. On 15 March, 1554, the Queen had appointed Bonner and others to a Commission to turn out some heretical bishops. Amongst these latter was John Taylor, "doctor of divinity, naming himself bishop of Lincoln".†

The Register *Sede Vacante* of the Dean and Chapter of Canterbury informs us that Taylor was duly deprived on account of "nullitatem consecrationis". By Canon Law a bishop was bound to receive episcopal consecration within three months of his appointment to a see. Taylor had been appointed to Lincoln on 21 June, 1552, and consecrated bishop by the Edwardine rite five days later, i.e. on 26 June, well within the canonical three months. We may dismiss the ludicrous suggestion of Dixon‡ that "the nullity of consecration here alleged was not meant to deny that they were bishops, but that any of them was the bishop of the see to which he was consecrated"! There is only one explanation of the phrase: *Taylor had not been consecrated bishop by any rite which could be admitted by the Catholic Church.*

Bonner, then, disbelieved in the Edwardine rite for the episcopate, in March 1554. Could he have believed

* Evidently he had been tonsured at some previous ordination.

† See the Commission in *Burnet*, Vol. V, p. 388.

‡ *History of the Church of England*, Vol. IV, p. 138.

in it in July 1554, i.e. at the time of this rehabilitation? Obviously not. But in that case what is the explanation of this rehabilitation? It is quite simple: *the document has nothing to do with Scory at all! It is the rehabilitation of quite a different person, John Bird, Bishop of Chester!*

This ecclesiastic had been consecrated by the Pontifical rite in the reign of Henry VIII. But he was not too orthodox, and during the reign of Edward VI he had taken to himself a "wife". And accordingly, on 13 March, 1554, Queen Mary had issued a Commission to Bonner and other bishops to turn Bird and other married bishops out of their sees, imposing upon them a suitable penance: "*poenitentiam salutarem et congruam pro modo culpae vestro . . . arbitrio imponendam eisdem injungentes*".*

The Commission duly deprived Bird of his see.† Now Bird evidently came to live in the London diocese, and on 6 November, 1554, he was appointed Vicar of Dunmow in Essex (then in the London diocese) by Bishop Bonner. Moreover, Bonner employed him in London, as his "suffragan", for an ordination in December 1554, and Strype says he resided for a time at Fulham Palace.‡ *Bird, then, is the bishop, the "confrater" of Bonner, who was restored to his "pastoral office" as well as to his "ecclesiastical ministry", within the Diocese of London.* The registrar or clerk who copied the document into Bonner's Register made the easily understandable mistake of writing "*Cicestriensis*" instead of "*Cestriensis*". The Christian name of the two bishops was the same—Joannes.

Note that before Bird could thus officiate, he would require to be rehabilitated. *There is no other rehabilitation of a bishop in Bonner's Register besides this one.* Note further that the rehabilitation says that the guilty bishop John had performed the penance which Bonner had imposed upon him. *Bonner had been told to impose a penance upon Bird by Queen Mary.*§

* See the Commission in *Burnet*, Vol. V, pp. 386, 387.

† Cf. Register of Dean and Chapter of Canterbury: "*Cestren. sedes vacavit per deprivationem Johannis Birde senis conjugati.*"

‡ Strype, *Cranmer*, p. 88.

§ Compare the two statements: "*poenitentiam salutarem et congruam . . . eisdem injungentes*" (Commission to Bonner and others to turn out Bird and others), "*poenitentiam per nos sibi injunctam salutarem peregit*" (document of "rehabilitation").

Moreover, there is clear evidence that *Scory was not in England at the time this dispensation was issued*, i.e. in July 1554.*

Scory had preached the funeral sermon for Edward VI in Westminster Abbey early in August 1553. He evidently remained in London for a few weeks, for Cranmer gave him a copy of his famous "Declaration against the Mass", which was publicly read in Cheapside on 5 September. He was probably still in England on 20 November 1553, for Terentianus, writing from Strassburg on that date to John ab Ulmist and describing the situation in England, says that Scory has been deprived of his see of Chichester, but says nothing of his flight from the country, which had therefore presumably not yet taken place. But the next year, i.e. 1554, we find him acting as Superintendent of the Church of the English Protestant refugees, at Embden. When did he go there? The Church at Embden had been founded before February 1554, for on that date Peter Martyr wrote from Strassburg to Bullinger, telling the latter how the Polish reformer Alasco had fled from England on 15 September, 1553, and had eventually gone to Embden, when the Princess gave him "and his friends" permission to have "two churches of foreigners, one English and the other French". Now *Scory was certainly at Embden in July 1554, if not before*. For on 2 August, 1554, the English refugees at Frankfort sent round a circular letter to the other refugees, at Strassburg, Embden, and elsewhere. When the Strassburg refugees received it, Grindal, who was then at Strassburg, "wrote to Master Scory at Embden", suggesting that he should come and take over the superintendency of the English Church at Frankfort.†

Scory's presence at Embden was therefore known at Strassburg in *August*, and the inference is that he must have been at Embden in *July*, for we must allow sufficient time for the news to travel from Embden to Strassburg.

* Burnet, II, p. 442, says it was dated 14 July. But as the day of the month is not inserted in the document in Bonner's Register, Burnet is apparently here drawing upon his imagination. He has chosen a safe date, in the middle of the month.

† *Original Letters*, p. 365 et seq.

‡ *Troubles at Frankfort*, p. xiii.

Now *July is the very same month in which Scory is supposed to have been rehabilitated by Bonner!* The thing is quite impossible. If Scory had been reinstated as a bishop by Bonner in July, is it conceivable that he should at Embden, in the same month, be acting as Superintendent of the English Protestants?

Burnet* says, "he soon after fled out of England", but gives no reason. Dodd† says it was because he "met with no preferment". But in that case it must be said he did not allow Bonner any time to give him preferment!

We conclude, then, that *this rehabilitation cannot possibly apply to Bishop Scory, but it must and does undoubtedly apply to Bishop Bird, late of Chester.* Scory was not the man to ask for such a rehabilitation, and he seems to have been already abroad when it was granted. Bird *did* need a rehabilitation, for he exercised both "ecclesiastical and pastoral functions" within the London diocese.

But in this case how is it that the document has always been supposed to apply to Scory? The answer is that it was first unearthed from the London diocesan archives by Burnet at the end of the seventeenth century, and printed by him in his *History of the Reformation*. Burnet noted the word "Cicestrensis", never guessed that it was a clerical error, and weaved round it the story of Scory's supposed rehabilitation. Every subsequent writer has taken Burnet's view for granted.‡ No previous writer had ever made any use of this very useful argument for Anglican Orders—not even Bramhall, who *inter alia* maintains that no Anglican clerics were ever reordained in Mary's reign, that Anglican Orders were recognized as valid by Cardinal Pole and by Pope Paul IV himself, and so on! No one ever suggested that Bonner had recognized Edwardine episcopal Orders—not even Foxe, who would doubtless have commented on it if it had really happened—until Burnet produced this document from the London Register. Since then it has been a *cause célèbre*.

* Burnet, II, p. 443.

† Tierney's *Dodd*, p. 67.

‡ Thus it figures in works of reference such as Cooper's *Athenae Cantab.* and the *Dictionary of National Biography*.

One last point. It has been suggested by many Catholic writers that, as Bonner himself had not been reconciled to the Holy See, this particular act of rehabilitation must have been *ultra vires* and also without any approval either of Cardinal Pole or the Pope. There is a modicum of truth in this. But on the other hand it must be remembered that already, in January 1554, Queen Mary had written to Cardinal Pole asking him what she was to do in the matter of getting rid of married and heretical bishops; and that in February of the same year Pole sent over Goldwell, with verbal and written instructions as to how she should proceed. In consequence of these instructions, Mary issued in March 1554 her two Commissions to Bonner and others to depose the married and heretical bishops, and thus to make way for the new ones.* It must be remembered that already in February the Queen had sent over to Pole the names of twelve suitable persons for promotion to episcopal sees.† Thus, the action taken against Bishop Bird in depriving him of his see must have had Pole's cordial approval. As to the rehabilitation of married clerics in general, and of Bird in particular, by Bishop Bonner, Pole was probably aware of what was going on, and agreed to tolerate it, as a necessary measure for the coming Reconciliation, though he could not formally approve of the action.

But at any rate one thing is now quite clear, and that is that Bishop Bonner certainly did not recognize the episcopal Orders of an Edwardine bishop.

E. C. MESSENGER.

* This explains why and how Bonner was able to deal with Bishop Bird.

† *Venetian Calendar*, Vol. V, p. 471.

TWO GREAT ANGLICAN CHURCHMEN

Viscount Halifax, 1839-1885. By J. G. Lockhart. 285 pp.
(Geoffrey Bles. 12s. 6d.)

Randall Davidson, Archbishop of Canterbury. By G. K. A. Bell,
Bishop of Chichester. 2 vols., xvii + 1428 pp. (Oxford
University Press. 36s.)

BIOGRAPHIES have recently appeared of these two great men, of very different opinions, each of whom played a prominent part in the history of the Anglican Church over a prolonged period of years. Of the life of Viscount Halifax we have, as yet, only the first instalment, which carries us down only to the year 1885. But the controversy on Anglican Orders with which he was most prominently connected in later years, and with which his name will, no doubt, be especially remembered in the future, is already sufficiently documented in other works; and the same may also be said of the "Malines Conversations" of which he was the principal originator. It is not impossible, therefore, to treat the two lives together, in a brief sketch of some of the important changes in the Church of England in which they took their respective parts, and which have so profoundly affected the general outlook and opinions in that body.

Charles Wood, Lord Halifax, the senior of the two by nearly ten years, was born in 1839. He came of a great Whig family on both sides. He was the grandson of Lord Grey of the Reform Bill, and the son of one of Queen Victoria's most trusted statesmen. He was taken as a child to see Metternich and the Princess Lieven, and could just remember them both. He was at Eton when the Duke of Wellington died, and at Oxford came under the influence of Pusey and Liddon, so that to the end of his long life he remained essentially a "Puseyite", even though in many points he had advanced far beyond his teacher. He was chosen by the Prince Consort as a most suitable companion for Prince Albert Edward, and was Groom of the Bedchamber in the Prince's first independent establishment. His friendship with the Prince remained unbroken to the end, when the latter had succeeded to the throne as King Edward VII. It is no

wonder, with such an origin, and with the very high gifts both of intellect and of character which were his, that he early became the lay leader of the High Church party in the Established Church and was universally loved and respected even by those who could not share his opinions.

It was at Oxford that he first came into contact with any approach to Catholic doctrines and ceremonial. Certainly his early experiences at Hickleton did not tend in that direction. The "perpetual curate" at that place, commonly known as "the Divine Jack", was an excellent fox-hunting parson of the old days, devoted to his work and his parish, but quite innocent of theology. The Woods sat in church in a large pew with a fire-place, a red-cushioned seat all round its walls, and a big foot-scraper outside its door but inside the church. Sir Charles and Lady Mary sat in the two corners next the fire, and the fire was always poked at the end of the Litany. The rest sat facing one another all round the pew. The communion-table was covered with dark blue velvet which was never changed and had neither cross nor candlesticks upon it. A village band with instruments was in the large gallery. As to the religious observance of the parish, no one except two or three old people and the parish clerk ever thought of communicating, and Communion was administered only on three or four occasions in the year. The church, in fact, was very much like most country churches in England in the forties and fifties, and was as yet entirely untouched by any kind of Catholic revival.

Eton left Charles Wood much where he was as regards religious opinions. Public-school religion, then, as now, was not of an awakening character. But Oxford in the fifties was another matter. Readers of Cardinal Newman's *Loss and Gain* may, perhaps, get an idea of the atmosphere of the time. Organized games did not as yet fill anything like the space they do at present in an undergraduate's life, and there was more time for the constant discussions, mainly theological, which largely filled their place. Walking was still a very general form of exercise, the "Headington grind", perhaps, or a visit to Boars Hill—still unbuilt upon and wild. A "beaver

walk" such an expedition was called, since a beaver hat—a "tall hat", as we call its successor—was always worn, and many an eager controversy was carried on on these occasions, to be concluded, perhaps, over tea in College rooms, taken, not in the afternoon, but at nine o'clock in the evening.

Although he took his full part in social life at Christ Church, where he was entered as a gentleman commoner and became a member of the Bullingdon Club, it was at Oxford that his religious life began to become definite, and his first steps were taken towards a more Catholic outlook. But London even more than Oxford matured his views. It was the period of the beginning of Ritualism and of the riots and disturbances which the new practices evoked among classes who had been quite unmoved by the theological propositions advanced by the earlier Tractarians. These practices involved changes which could be seen, and which made some practical difference to those who attended Church services; and an intense opposition was at once aroused. Looking back upon the period, one is constantly impressed by the trivial character of the changes introduced in many cases, which yet were clung to by the innovators as if they were really vital, in spite of all the abuse and actual violence which they called forth. The questions, for instance, whether a black gown or a surplice should be worn in the pulpit, whether or not a cassock was allowable, led, at St. George's in the East, to actual riots. In the West, at the new churches of All Saints, Margaret Street, St. Barnabas, Pimlico, and St. Paul, Knightsbridge, the controversy was more definitely doctrinal and raged over such matters as the eastward position, the cross and candlesticks on the communion-table, and the practice of confession; but the opposition aroused was scarcely less vehement, and here, too, there were frequent disturbances. Parliament itself stepped in after the ineptitude of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council—the final Court of Appeal resulting from the Royal Supremacy—had become obvious, but the new legislation—the Act for the Regulation of Public Worship—only made things worse.

It was in the earlier stages of this Ritualistic movement that Charles Wood first began to take his place as a High Church leader. Scenes such as were taking place in St. George's in the East, as described in a letter written to him in 1860 by Augustus Hare, made a deep impression on his mind. The church, so Hare wrote, was "filled with a surging mob, all talking as if in the street and pulling your coat and asking if you were a Puseyite ; a torrent of responses, an uproar of voices shouting, the choristers singing with all their might, and the organ (which has lost even the *power* of producing a soft note) pealing and crashing over the whole". Such was what was described by the Rector as a quiet Sunday, for there was no actual violence. No wonder that in such surroundings the minds of the studious were turned almost irresistibly towards higher ideals of worship. Charles Wood, fresh from Oxford, Pusey, and Liddon, was moving fast in the Catholic direction.

Already, among those who were thinking with him, the desire for the return of some form of religious life was making itself felt. The first to make the attempt to revive it among men, the Rev. Joseph Lyne, better known as "Father Ignatius", was a man of fervid zeal and considerable gifts, but with very little judgement. He had made a foundation at Norwich, apparently aiming, as afterwards at Llanthony, at a double convent, one part for men and the other for women, both of which should be under his direction. He had also adopted as an oblate a young boy, commonly known as "the Infant Samuel", who was dressed in the habit and kept the rule. Every Friday the child was whipped for the faults he had doubtless committed, and to increase his love for Our Lord. One is not altogether surprised to know that in later life he became notorious as "Ex-Monk Widdows". Mr. Lockhart mentions the strange pilgrimage to Rome which took place in 1866. Fr. Ignatius, accompanied by "an indeterminate female and a child in sandals", all wearing what was intended to be the Benedictine habit, duly arrived at the Holy City and took up their abode at an hotel. Naturally their arrival caused much wonderment, and indeed a little scandal. The Rome of Pius IX was

not accustomed to Benedictine abbots accompanied by a Reverend Mother and a Benedictine baby, all staying together at a secular hotel. Bishop Brownlow, then a student at the Collegio Pio, used to tell how he was sent by his rector to call upon them and explain the situation. It was in the morning, not very early, but Fr. Ignatius was unwell and not yet up, so he was received by the "Reverend Mother". While they were talking the door opened and a tonsured head—with the full ring tonsure—made its appearance, saying, "Sister Mary, Sister Mary, what *have* you done with my trousers?" In the upshot the party were persuaded to leave Rome before more wonderment had been excited. Charles Wood visited the establishment at Norwich, but did not feel that he could join them, which perhaps is not surprising.

A much more important attempt at the revival of religious life was being made at the same time at Cowley. A meeting was held in London and was attended by Richard Meux Benson, Bishop Forbes of Brechin, Reginald Tuke, Charles Wood, George Lane Fox, and Fr. Grafton, who afterwards became a bishop in America. This meeting resulted in the foundation of the Society of St. John the Evangelist, better known as the Cowley Fathers. It is interesting to learn that both Wood and Lane Fox actually went into retreat at Cowley with a view of joining the Society, though in the event neither of them did so. Lane Fox, before the year was out, had made his submission to Rome, but Lord Halifax remained faithful and returned again and again to make retreats at Cowley, the last occasion being in December 1931, when he was already ninety-two years of age.

In 1865, when he was twenty-six, Charles Wood took the important step of joining the English Church Union, and thereby declaring himself publicly as of the advanced party in the Church. Three years later, on the resignation of its then President, Mr. Colin Lindsay—who soon afterwards made his submission to Rome—he was elected President, an office which he held almost to the end of his long life.

The great trouble in the Church of England was still the quarrel over ceremonial. Of course the underlying

matter at issue was no less than the Real Presence of Our Lord and the nature of the worship which that Presence would demand, but the battle was very often fought about the most trivial details. Certainly some clergymen were doing the most extraordinary things. The constantly recurring accusation that such and such a clergyman had ridden up to the church on Palm Sunday mounted on a donkey was probably without foundation in any case, though it was made again by Cornelia, Lady Wimborne, as late as the middle eighties. Bishop Creighton, on that occasion, being asked what was the meaning of the phrase in the Liturgy *hanc tuam creaturam palmarum*, said that he thought it must mean "Lady Wimborne's donkey". It was said that Mr. Purchas of Brighton suspended a gilt dove over the altar on Whit Sunday, and a stuffed bird duly figured among the "exhibits" at his trial. This clergyman was charged with no less than thirty-five illegal practices, most of them entirely trivial. It was alleged against him in evidence that he wore a cassock so long that it was impossible to know whether or not he wore trousers—"an appalling instance of Jesuitical secretiveness", as Dr. Littledale observed. Mr. Hawker of Morwenstow, who was never prosecuted, went beyond them all in eccentricity. He strewed wormwood on the floor of his church, wore yellow vestments of the strangest cut, took his dogs and cats with him to church, and stalked about his parish in a claret-coloured suit, a blue seaman's jersey, and a brimless pink hat, a combination of garments hardly to be excused even in a poet or a genius.

But, although these prosecutions had their comic side and read today sometimes like an ill-bred joke, there were very real matters at stake. The ceremonial quarrels have long since died down with the increasing lack of interest in such matters, and every clergyman today is very much a law to himself; but the other principle at stake—the right of the Church of England to govern herself and not to be considered as a mere Department of the State—is still as far as ever from settlement, as was made very clear to all in the comparatively recent debates in the House of Commons on the Reform of the Prayer Book.

The first connexion between the future Lord Halifax and Randall Davidson, the future Archbishop, was through one of these Ritualistic disturbances. Mr. Arthur Tooth, a young clergyman of some private means, had furnished a derelict church at Hatcham, of which he had been appointed Vicar, with ornaments in accordance with his own views. An imported mob of hooligans soon appeared. Tooth always declared they were paid by the Church Association, the men being paid half a crown each and the boys a shilling. They kept their hats on, booed and hooted through the service, and fought with members of the congregation. Wood, as President of the E.C.U., went down in support, and was "stirred as he had never felt stirred before" by the opposing mob. A little later, when Tooth had been duly lodged in Horse-monger Lane gaol for his contumacy, Davidson, as Chaplain to Archbishop Tait, was sent down to take the services for him and if possible to restore peace.

Randall Davidson owed as little as did Lord Halifax to any High Church influence in his youth. He was baptized in his father's house by a Presbyterian minister and according to the Presbyterian form. He was not himself actually a son of the manse, but his grandfather and his great-grandfather were both very well known ministers in the Established Church of Scotland. Nor does he seem himself ever to have been made formally a member of the Church of England, though his father generally attended the Episcopalian Church and, when asked whether he was a Presbyterian or an Episcopalian, would answer, "I am both, and if I were one or the other only I should be false to my deepest beliefs." Such a home, deeply religious though kept apart from all doctrinal controversies, no doubt laid the foundation of the future Archbishop's position in such matters. One could hardly find two men more widely different in this respect than Lord Halifax and Archbishop Davidson. Halifax took for his aim the restoration of Catholic life in all its forms within the Church of England, which he fervently believed had never forfeited its Catholic inheritance. He pursued that aim wholeheartedly and unswervingly to the very end of his long life, stopping short only at the

conclusion that the primacy of Rome was of Divine origin and therefore commanded the obedience of every Christian. This single aim dominated his whole life and everything else was subordinated to it. Davidson on the other hand was "all things to all men", and if not, like his father, Presbyterian as well as Episcopalian, he was Evangelical as well as High Church; Catholic, in his own sense of the word, as well as Protestant; Broad Church at the same time that he was both High and Low. And, like his father again, he would have been false to his deepest beliefs had he been other than he was. No one could doubt his piety or his essential honesty. But he was the very embodiment of the Church of England in her comprehensiveness and love of compromise. There lay his strength as Archbishop of Canterbury, but also sometimes his weakness. On the occasion of the General Strike, for example, when things were at the crisis, the present writer was on the Sunday evening in the Senior Common Room of his Oxford college. A special wireless instalment had been arranged, for the Archbishop's sermon at St. Martin's was to be broadcast and all were eager to know what he would say. The result was profoundly disappointing. On the great question at issue—the lawfulness of a general strike for the aims of a party—he said nothing at all. He confined himself to a general assurance that the Church was alive and awake to what was happening and that its leaders were doing their best. He came to an end, and one of his listeners broke the silence and expressed the feeling of all by saying, "He is still sitting on the fence and doesn't mean to come down." Then followed the "News" with the following as its first item: "Cardinal Bourne, preaching today at Westminster Cathedral, made the following declaration:

"The time through which we are passing is of an exceptional character, and the present strike is of a nature quite unlike the many others which have preceded it. It is necessary that Catholics should have clearly before their minds the moral principles which are involved.

"1. There is no moral justification for a general strike of this character. It is a direct challenge to lawfully constituted authority, and inflicts, without adequate reason, immense discomfort and

injury on millions of our fellow countrymen. It is therefore a sin against the obedience which we owe to Almighty God, who is the Source of that authority, and against the charity and brotherly love which are due to our brethren.

"2. All are bound to uphold and assist the Government, which is the lawfully constituted authority of the country and represents therefore in its own appointed sphere the authority of God Himself.

"3. As God alone can guide both rulers and ruled to wise and successful understanding, it is the duty of all to pray earnestly and constantly for His guidance that the day may be hastened when this unhappy conflict shall terminate in a just and lasting peace."

Once more there was silence, and then the same speaker as before, turning to me, said, "Your man knows his mind—ours doesn't." It expressed what most were feeling about the Archbishop's failure to rise to the opportunity.

The life of Archbishop Davidson which has been written by the Bishop of Chichester is of portentous length, running to 1350 pages of library size, closely printed. It is obviously impossible to deal with such a mass of material within the limits of a single article. We shall therefore confine ourselves to a single episode, one in which both Lord Halifax and the Archbishop played leading parts, and one also which is of very great interest to Catholic readers—the story of the "Malines Conversations" of 1921–26.

Lord Halifax was a man of transparent integrity and singleness of purpose. "I cannot imagine His Lordship deceiving anyone", was Cardinal Vaughan's opinion. He had devoted his whole life to a single object, the restoration of the Church of England to a fuller Catholicism with the ultimate aim of eventual reunion with the Apostolic See. But he was not a man of wide vision. He went through life, as it were, wearing blinkers. He could not bring himself to realize the true state of the Church of England, nor how very small was the party which was prepared to go the whole way with him. Nor again could he ever rid himself of an incurable hopefulness that Rome itself could be brought to view things through his eyes and see only what he had allowed himself to see. "Lord Halifax", said Archbishop Benson of him at an earlier period, "is like a solitary player of chess

and always wants to make all the moves on the board himself, on both sides."

Archbishop Davidson was just as honest and straightforward as Lord Halifax, but he was before all else a diplomatist. He, too, had a clear idea of the object to which his life must be devoted. He had to hold the Church of England together and prevent it from breaking up. He had to satisfy and to keep in an outward unity at least half a dozen warring parties within its borders. In that object he was marvellously successful. No one else, perhaps, could have done so well in so difficult a position. But the difficulty developed his natural Scottish caution until it became his ruling characteristic. Nor could he ever throw off that fear of Rome and of Catholic doctrine which was one result of his Presbyterian origin. He would speak of "those distinctive and unscriptural doctrines which bulk so large in the Roman system as a whole", or, again, of "Roman accretions upon the true, primitive, Scriptural faith of the Church". Whether he fully understood the doctrines he thus condemned is another matter. Even the most exalted of Anglican prelates have not always done so. At least he would hardly have endorsed the words of the Head of one of the leading Oxford colleges, who was reported to have said, when preaching on the Immaculate Conception in the chapel of another college, that "whereas the superstition of the Middle Ages deified the Mother of God, it was reserved for the superstition of the nineteenth century to deify His Grandmother".

But, besides this fear of Roman doctrines, Davidson was deeply imbued with a dread of "Italian methods". Dealings with Catholic ecclesiastics he saw "as having an element of danger for the Church of England, as leading the unwary and uninformed to make less than they ought of the deep and even fundamental differences which still remain". The language is more diplomatic, but one feels that in him there was the essential spirit of Newman's Dr. Bluett.

Dr. Bluett's jaw dropped and his eyes assumed a hollow aspect. "You will corrupt their minds, sir," he said—"you will corrupt

their minds." Then he added, in a sepulchral tone, which came from the very depths of his inside: "You will introduce them, sir, to some subtle Jesuit—to some subtle Jesuit, Mr. Reding."

When, therefore, Lord Halifax and the Abbé Portal—the same two who, some twenty-five years before, had taken such a prominent part in the ill-fated discussions on Anglican Orders—presented themselves before Archbishop Davidson and asked for his support in certain "Conversations" which they desired to initiate with Cardinal Mercier of Malines on the possibilities of Reunion, it was not to be expected that they would be received with enthusiasm. The Archbishop, indeed, was torn in two directions. On the one hand, he had a genuine longing for Reunion of all Christians, not excluding Rome itself. On the other hand there was his innate dread of Rome and of "Italian methods". He did not refuse to give an introduction but was supremely cautious in his way of doing so. Lord Halifax, he insisted, went to Malines with no commission and representing no one but himself. If he and his two companions, Dean Armitage Robinson and the Rev. Walter Frere, thought that good could come of such "Conversations", and if the Cardinal was willing to receive them, he would not oppose, but he would not allow himself to be in any way involved in any kind of responsibility.

The three Anglicans, accompanied by the Abbé Portal, went to Malines and were received kindly by the Cardinal. He asked his Vicar General, now his successor as Cardinal van Roey, to join him, and the six spent three days in preliminary discussions. The result seemed hopeful to both sides, and the three companions—one may not as yet call them delegates—returned to England and made their report to this effect to the Archbishop. Nine months passed before any further step was taken. Meanwhile Pope Benedict XV had passed away and the present Pontiff had been elected in his place. Then, in October 1922, Lord Halifax once more applied for a definite "mission" to be given by the Archbishop for the "Conversations" to be renewed. The Archbishop replied that if he were to give such a "mission" it could only be

if some similar recognition were to come from the Vatican itself. Otherwise it would be perfectly possible, if Mercier died, for the Vatican to disclaim all responsibility for his action by saying that he was certainly "a very good man but a little weak in his old age". If the Vatican signified approval he was ready to encourage the "Conversations", but not otherwise. The necessary approval having been obtained from Pius XI by Cardinal Mercier, the same six persons once more met at Malines and resumed the "Conversations". But the Archbishop was still nervous, and his letter of approval struck the Cardinal as manifesting before all else *une grande réserve*.

The Archbishop had some reason for his nervousness, for the Anglican delegation, with what seems extraordinary lack of judgement, plunged at once into a discussion as to whether the Pope, if difficulties could be surmounted, would send the *Pallium* to the archbishops in England. Even the Cardinal was startled by this jumping to administrative questions before the far more important doctrinal matters, which had necessarily first to be settled, had been at all adequately considered. But the Anglicans persisted and put the gift of the *Pallium* into their final suggestions for the course that the "Conversations" should now take. They signed a formal document to this effect and brought it back to the Archbishop for his approval. Davidson at once took fright. He saw clearly, as his delegates had failed to do, that such a proposal, made at that time, would set all Protestant England on fire. The *Pallium* was all right, of course, in a coat of arms, where it meant nothing at all, but as a practical proposition it was impossible. True, very few in England, outside the Catholic body, would have any idea what it meant, but that to the Protestant mind would only make it more certainly detestable. The more he thought about it, the more disturbed he became. It seemed that, if this sort of thing was going to happen, it might be best to withdraw his patronage altogether from the "Conversations". But before doing so he determined to consult Bishop Gore. Armitage Robinson, whom he had trusted to keep the other two delegates in order, had let him down. What did Bishop

Gore think about the matter? Bishop Gore entirely agreed with him. "I am writing to say", he replied, "that the concessiveness of our delegation to Malines, apparently at the first Conference and certainly at the second, seems to me more disastrous and perilous the more I think of it. It astonished me to hear from the Dean what he was prepared to admit as to Roman supremacy, and that he is prepared to contemplate the (conditional) reordination of the Anglican clergy from top to bottom."

This letter from Bishop Gore, while it increased the nervousness of the Archbishop, also brought a ray of comfort, for it suggested a way of escaping the dangers which seemed to threaten which yet fell short of the extreme step of suppressing the "Conversations" entirely. The Cardinal had said that he would welcome slightly enlarged numbers in the delegation, as making it more widely representative. Very well, then Gore should be added to it. On the Roman question, which after all was the one of vital importance, Gore was the sturdiest of Protestants. He at least could be trusted to stand up unmoved to the attacks of the wildest "Roman controversialists" and the most tortuous of "Italian methods". Gore should join the delegation. He would be able to keep the others straight. He, at least, would allow no talk of the *Pallium* or suchlike things but would stand firm to the positions laid down in the Thirty-nine Articles. If he were there, the Archbishop felt, all would be safe. Gore should be his watchdog.

Bishop Gore agreed to go, and the third "Conversation" accordingly took place at Malines on 7-8 November, 1923, the numbers being now increased by four: Gore and Dr. Kidd of Keble on the Anglican side, and Monsignor Batiffol and Père Hemmer on the other. This time the discussion was wholly confined to the position of St. Peter and his relation to the other Apostles. The Anglicans were quite willing to admit that St. Peter was the acknowledged chief or leader of the Apostles in the New Testament and that he was so accepted because he was so treated by Our Lord, but they maintained that "any power or prerogative given to him personally was really given to all the twelve, so that all constitute the

foundation of the Church, all have the keys of the Kingdom, and all have the authority to bind and loose. St. Peter's special position, therefore", they said, "we hold to have lain not in any jurisdiction which he himself held, but in a leadership among the other Apostles." Further than this, and here we may trace the restraining influence of Bishop Gore, they were not prepared to go.

When the results of this third "Conversation" were reported to the Archbishop, he was much more contented. Gore at least had not let him down. This was sound Anglican doctrine. This was in full accord with his favourite authorities, "the great Anglican divines of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries". He was encouraged even to the point of making the "Conversations" known to the general public. For if it came out that they were taking place in secret, and that he, the Archbishop of Canterbury, had given them his approval, who could say what mischief might result? But the publication of the fact led at once, in spite of all his caution, to a storm of angry criticism. It was then too late to turn back, and in spite of all that was said it was determined that the "Conversations" should continue. *Punch* summarized the position in an amusing poem.

Armitage, Armitage, Robinson, Gore,
Halifax, Frere, and Kidd
Were sometimes seen
On their way to Malines
Although they tried to be hid.

* * *

Armitage, Armitage, Robinson, Gore,
Halifax, Frere, and Kidd
Are now constantly seen
On their way to Malines
And no longer try to be hid.

So the fourth and last "Conversation" opened in May 1925, with the same membership as before. The main subject discussed was that of the relation of the episcopate to the Holy See, resumed from the last occasion. The Catholics, said Bishop Gore, "showed a surprising concessiveness in matters of organization, but were adamant

on all dogmatic issues". However, the atmosphere of "concessiveness" seems in the end to have affected even Gore himself, for the ultimate position admitted by the Anglicans certainly has a much more Catholic sound than any other passage we can remember in his various writings on the subject. It ran as follows :

The Church is a living body under the authority of the bishops as successors of the Apostles : and from the beginnings of Church History a primacy and leadership among all the bishops has been recognized as belonging to the Bishop of Rome. Nor can we imagine that any reunion of Christendom could be effected except on the recognition of the primacy of the Pope. . . .

The following points may be usefully stated :

1. The authority of the Pope is not separate from that of the episcopate : nor in normal circumstances can the authority of the episcopate be exercised in dissociation from that of its chief.

2. In virtue of that primacy the Pope can claim to occupy a position in regard to all other bishops which no other bishop claims to occupy in regard to him.

3. The exercise of that primacy has in times past varied in regard to time and place : and it may vary again. And this adds to the difficulty of defining the respective rights of the Holy See on the one side, and of the episcopate on the other.

It is a typically Anglican document, far as it goes in the Catholic direction. For it stops just short, as Anglican documents always do, of defining the reasons why the Pope has this primacy. Does he hold it as given to him by Christ and as the successor of St. Peter, or does he not ? Is it, in other words, of Divine or of merely ecclesiastical origin ? That is the vital question, and it is deliberately left untouched and undefined.

This was, as it turned out, the last of the "Conversations" to take place at Malines. Both the Cardinal and the Archbishop were anxious that they should go on and convinced that, on the whole, good had resulted from them. But it was not to be. Four days before the date fixed for their resumption, Cardinal Mercier passed away after less than a month's illness, and it was felt on both sides that his death made their continuance useless, if not impossible.

Archbishop Davidson remained at Canterbury for three years more, years which were made eventful by the General Strike and by the rejection in the House of Commons of the Revised Prayer Book which he had done so much to sponsor. A few weeks after its rejection he resigned his office. It was July 1928, and he was now eighty years of age. He lived in comparative retirement for two years more and died on 25 May, 1930. Lord Halifax, too, was by then a very old man indeed. He was nearly ten years older than the Archbishop, but he survived him by some years. When he, too, died in 1934 he was in his ninety-fifth year. To the last he remained faithful to the ideals which had guided his whole life and had won for him the love and respect of all with whom he came in contact. He has left no successor in the Church of England who is able in any way adequately to fill his place.

ARTHUR S. BARNES.

MARCH

Dawn stood,
Dark and still, on the edge of the World,
And blew from his twisted scarlet trumpets
A storm across the sky ;
And Light, fleeing from cloud to cloud,
Clashed his flaming wings together
And sent through the swiftly moving heavens
Long blasts of flying golden fire.

Dawn said :
"Let the month be uttermost wild !"
And beckoned—there fell the ragged shadow
Of March athwart the land ;
And he, crouched on the back of the Gale,
Taut with joy at the long-dreamed moment
Of curbless speed through boundless spaces,
Broke on the mazed World with power !

J. MACLEOD.

GERARD HOPKINS, JESUIT

Letters of Gerard Manley Hopkins to Robert Bridges and R. W. Dixon. Edited by C. C. Abbot. 2 vols. (Oxford University Press. 30s.)

Gerard Manley Hopkins. By G. F. Lahey, S.J. (Oxford University Press. 7s. 6d.)

Poems of Gerard Manley Hopkins. Edited by Robert Bridges. (Oxford University Press. 7s. 6d.)

The Mind and Poetry of Gerard Manley Hopkins, S.J. By Bernard Kelly. (St. Dominic's Press. 5s.)

WHEN Gerard Manley Hopkins decided to test his vocation in the Society of Jesus, Newman gave it as his clear and considered opinion that the best and even the perfect choice had been made, and he was equally sure that the intellect, the particular spirit and aptitudes of Hopkins would not have found their proper home either with the Benedictines or with the Oratorians, both of which Orders had received more than one longing look from the poet. Many non-Catholic critics and even a few Catholics have believed that the Ignatian rule placed a serious restriction on Hopkins so far, at any rate, as his literary activities and output were concerned. But Newman was right. A careful study of the correspondence which passed between the poet and his friends shows conclusively that any long silence or periodic rejection of the creative impulse was entirely one of free choice or actual temporary inability to write. Such periods are the common experience of every artist, no matter what may be his background. But apart from this, it became increasingly evident that the Jesuit rule and—as he himself would have termed it—the “instress” of the Ignatian exercises were precisely the stimulants which his particular turn of genius required. Indeed, it would be true to say that the habit of mind and will which was fostered in his life as a Jesuit transformed his work.

Under that influence it developed, changing from mere experimental versification into an authentic utterance, into poetry of the highest flight. As a Catholic he understood the secondary importance of his art, and, as a priest, its subservience to his sacerdotal duties and the

salvation of souls. Equally well he understood that it could be sharpened into, and handled as, an instrument for the direct expression both of his Faith and his priesthood, provided only it were allowed to materialize at the finger-tips of St. Ignatius. For the founder of the Order to which he owed allegiance had provided a way of life for which he was vocationally fitted. It followed that any work wrought outside and independent of the rules and discipline of that life would tend to become not only imperfect but lifeless. In other words, he humbled himself and deliberately emptied his creative mind in the Order of love and obedience, knowing, at the same time and on a philosophic basis, that his art, thereby, would gain rather than lose, and that his mind would be enriched, filled with a capacity and a sensibility of such a quality and kind as he could never have possessed in any other ethics. It was a perfectly individual necessity, individually considered, subject to authority. To attempt to understand Hopkins and his work apart from an appreciation of this animating spirit would be a waste of time.

His life, which despite its changes of environment and outlook was fundamentally consistent, may be reduced to three main periods: his boyhood, Oxford and early Catholic days, and the years that stretched between his joining the Society of Jesus and his death. There is evidence—scanty enough, it is true, yet sufficient—to show that Gerard in his schooldays was a boy illuminated by a humility which had no trace of what we should call in these days “an inferiority complex”. He was precocious but not in the least priggish; brilliant but not aggressively scintillating; mature for his age and yet essentially childlike. We can picture a good-looking, rather pale boy shining among his fellows so quietly and unobtrusively that he left behind him no sharply defined personality and no outstanding “life-portrait” by which he would easily be remembered. In 1878 the poet Canon Richard Watson Dixon, who had been his school-master, writes thus to him:

I think I remember you in the Highgate School. At least I remember a pale young boy, very light and active, with a very

meditative and intellectual face, whose name, if I am not vastly mistaken, was yours. If I am not deceived by memory, that boy got a prize for English poetry.

From so observant a man as Dixon this is ample evidence. The rest of Hopkins's life was but an extension of the same retirement. It was as though he spent his days in perpetual retreat. Outside his limited circle of friends and Jesuit brethren both the man and his tremendous genius remained practically unknown until years after his death. The symbolic character of such a life is obvious. Although a valuable and energetic member of an active Order, there was that side of his nature which was profoundly anchoritic. But his body was his cell.

Like many another intellectual at Oxford, before and since, Hopkins came under the stimulating influence of the Tractarians. Newman and Manning had long ago made their submission to the Holy See, and Liddon and Pusey now remained the acknowledged leaders of the Movement. To these able and admirable clerics Hopkins owed much of his early contact with Catholic doctrine. Under their guidance he began the practice of going to confession. The vision of a sacramental life opened up before him and made an instant appeal to his whole being. But so critical an intellect as his and so sensitive a spirit could hardly be satisfied with the Anglican shadow. It was only a matter of time, and, in his case, a very short time, before all his faculties opened their gates to receive the gift of faith. A day came when he wrote to Newman telling him of his desire to submit to the authority of the Catholic Church, and a few months later Newman himself received him at the Birmingham Oratory. And with the faith had come a sharp understanding of his vocation which led him before long into the Society of Jesus. A Jesuit he remained for the rest of his life, suffering deeply at the hands of the world and yet enjoying every year with an increasing intensity. Of delicate fibre, he found it hard to endure the terrible manifestation of human misery with which, as a priest, he was constantly coming in contact. But that same delicate fibre caused him the profoundest joy when he

touched, as he often did, the loveliness of humanity and the natural beauties of the world. The pain and the joy parented his sanctity and his poetry. From them issued perception, concise thought, the spirit's response to the spiritual, ready sympathies, and all those well-driven emotions which raced down and up the rivers of his blood carrying the cargoes of genius which were carefully unloaded only at the right moments and at the right quaysides.

An amazing but almost inevitable spate of nonsense has been written concerning Hopkins since Robert Bridges gave his poems to a clamorous literary world. Critics of every school—his Jesuit brethren must not be excepted—have done their best and worst to extol, to explain, to cloud, to clear, to synthesize, and to analyse what was, after all, but a simple—I use the word advisedly and in its philosophical sense—expression of positively natural genius, however original and even revolutionary it may have been. Gerard Hopkins would have detested all the ridiculous efforts to obscure his artistic theories by references to the Scotist influence, Bacchantic psychology, sensual asceticism, and so on. The quite ordinary fact about his work remains. In his ears was a certain music, to his eyes came the inscape of the objective world, to his nostrils the scent within the scent of nature, to his spirit both the stress and the quietude of the Divine revelation. In short he had the poet's experience, in his own individual fashion. That is all. To create an intricate problem of either the man or his work is typical of the method employed by contemporary critics who seem to pay a superstitious reverence to anything that is—or can be made to appear—inexplicable.

This being so, it would be well, before turning to the poet within the man and his work as a poet, to attempt some understanding of the emotive powers which consistently animated his vision, both objective and subjective. First of all, it should be remembered that we are approaching an intellect essentially rare and individual, a mind which may not be judged—outside the indefectible moral and universal standards—by any normal psychological measurements. Every artist, worthy of

the name, has his own exclusive angle of vision, but in the case of Hopkins the angle was so acute and determined that it would be difficult to apply the usual tests, aesthetic or otherwise. He has been accused by Bridges and many others of being sensual in his asceticism. The opposite would be nearer but still far from the truth. He was certainly not ascetic in his sensualism, for the simple reason that he was never, either in his life or in his art, sensual. Sensitive—and even sensuous—he was, always to a profound degree and in an intense manner. But the whole nature and purpose of his sensory life is misunderstood if it is considered apart from its saintliness. As an authentic Christian of the Thomist-Ignatian tradition, he laboured, all through his Catholic years, to fulfil the unity of himself. He believed effectively that the eye which delights in shapes and colours, and the nostrils which are sensitive to perfumes, and the hand which delight in textures, and the tongue which tastes, are essentially one with the soul that longs after goodness, the will that loves God, and the mind that reasons in order to understand. He believed in the complete triune man, and he moved his senses according to the full purposes for which they were created. In other words he used the sensory powers harmoniously and intellectually. And that is not sensuality, which generally spells an abuse of harmony. Of the fall of man Hopkins himself said: "The contact with God was broken, the commonwealth undone, the kingdom divided and brought to desolation."* So with sensuality. It divides the kingdom, impairs the unity of a man. Hopkins kept the contract and the character. He understood, so well, the value of his senses as instruments for giving glory to the glories of God. In 1870 he wrote:

I do not think I have ever seen anything more beautiful than the bluebell I have been looking at. I know the beauty of our Lord by it. Its inscape is mixed of strength and grace, like an ash-tree.

That is typical of his objective sensory attitude: completely childlike, strongly mature, poetic, decisively

* From a sermon on Original Sin.

Christian. But his nature was composite; which is another way of saying that he was, in a special fashion, representative of *homo sapiens*, a pale but no less real reflection of his incarnate God, "made in His image" not only in the natural order of creation but by exercise of his own will drawing upon innate resources. Very possibly he was "Uranian", disciplined so that there was no shadow upon that "imperfect perfection" which frequently leads its victims through the rich wine of their nature to the dregs. But, however that may be, there can be little doubt that the male and female ingredients of his nature together vitalized his extraordinary power of perceiving the inscape in all things and translating it into verse through his ear for music. He had the feminine concern for detail and the masculine wide imperial outlook strangely interlocked to form an artistic oneness, a unity that was nothing if not strong. Shakespeare, who was at least *anima naturaliter Catholica*, was apparently of this kind of temperament, while Milton—to whom Hopkins owed much more so far as verse technique is concerned—was so aggressively masculine that his work has never received anything more significant than admiration. Even the temper of his contemporaries was but vaguely sympathetic. But Hopkins—like Shakespeare—has succeeded in catching at the very heart-strings of men and women today, even when they understand him imperfectly. There is a warmth and a colour in his poems, not that of firelight so much as of sunlight shining on water-washed stones; a type of subdued gaiety reflecting the awful and delightful omnipresence of God. But that is not to say that his work was in a minor key. On the contrary he could and did emulate the solemn thunderings of a Milton, the clear, saturating lyricism of a Keats, and even the rollicking measures of a Villon, while remaining all the time within his own individual disciplined rhythm.

About the obscurities, the neologisms, and "revolutionary" technique of Hopkins's verse even more nonsense has been talked and written than about the imaginary conflict between Hopkins the Jesuit and Hopkins the poet. The simple fact—upon which any future con-

sideration of his work must be based—remains: he was essentially a traditionalist. He was much more of a traditionalist than his contemporaries Tennyson and Swinburne, since his use of the stress as opposed to the syllable, and his rhythm, together with clever inversions, are native to the main stream of English poetic structure from Langland to Blake. The same may be said of his alliteration. The craftsmanship of Hopkins—for all its apparent novelty—was merely the logical development and fulfilment of the Anglo-Saxon method. The abrupt sounds and staccato emphasis merging into a rising and falling metre which are so characteristic of his verse were embryonic in *Piers Plowman* and almost mature in Donne's lyrics. Shakespeare, Keats and the Romantics, the pre-Raphaelites, the later Victorians, and our modern Georgians belong to a different though not unrelated lineage born of the Graeco-Latinism of the Renaissance.

Monosyllabic Saxon is at the root of Hopkins's architectural method. But he was also a musician, and it is not difficult to detect a mechanized musical notation tapping like a little hammer along his lines. In this—and in this alone—is he unique among the poets. Generally speaking, poetry is not so nearly related to music as to sculpture. It is specifically lapidary. Hopkins knew this but enriched the whole tradition of English verse by embroidering into it the conceits of the violin and the piano without in any way destroying its fundamental simplicity. Therein lay his genius. He was not entrapped in that embroidery as in a net, nor caught, as were some of the lesser pre-Raphaelites, in a difficult mesh of insignificant flowers. And the key to his success lay in the self-discipline which characterized his whole life and which was confirmed by the Ignatian exercises.

But we ought not to psycho-analyse a poet. Unfortunately, in the confusion of the day it is sometimes unavoidable. It is a characteristic of our age that men will refuse to listen and to believe. Distrust and suspicion have so taken hold on us that it is never easy to see, hear, smell, or touch a thing in its native simplicity. We read Hopkins—many of us—deliberately searching for loud obscurities, and, doing so, instantly miss both the poet

and the poem. The obscurities exist actually in the reader's mind and not in the verse. But properly to understand and appreciate the work of Hopkins, or that of any other poet, it is necessary, in the first place, to approach it with some working knowledge of what poetry is and how a poem comes to be created at all. Poetry is the expression and interpretation in rhythmic language of the experiences of individual minds. Those experiences may be objective or subjective but, as interpreted in poetry worthy of the name, are always related to physical phenomena and external facts. That is to say they are not attempts to bring about, within the mind, emotion and experience which are artificially excited and have no real existence. In the case of Hopkins it seems that his entire life, subsequent to his reception into the Church, had one focal point: the Blessed Sacrament. The Host was the centre and explanation of his every experience. His whole emotive life revolved around It, received the refractions of Its light, and was illuminated by It as by the sun. In his constant enjoyment of the inscape and instress of created things he saw a multitude of sacramentals, each one a faint reflection of the supreme Sacrament. Every spondee and dactyl in his lines, every rise and fall of his metre is measured only to praise the God Incarnate, the Host.

In the third stanza of "The Wreck of the Deutschland" the whole secret—if secret it be—is revealed:

The frown of his face
Before me, the hurtle of hell
Behind where, where was a, where was a place?
I whirled out wings that spell
And fled with a fling of the heart to the heart of the Host.
My heart, but you were dovewinged, I can tell,
Carrier-witted, I am bold to boast,
To flash from the flame to the flame then, tower from
The grace to the grace.

And that is nothing if not autobiographical. He is ever crying as in his "The Golden Echo":

Give beauty back, beauty, beauty, beauty back to God,
beauty's self and beauty's giver.

He was always proclaiming that the world is "news of God". Every blade of grass is a type of Gabriel and every stone an angel winged with the white gospel of peace. And all is summed up, as it were, and concentrated in the wheat beaten into unleavened bread, returned to and merged in the Creator, transubstantiated into Him.

I walk, I lift up, lift up heart, eyes
Down all that glory in the heavens to glean our Saviour.

It is thus the priest-poet speaks all through his poems, in that voice, of that manner, believing thus and loving thus :

. . . old earth's groping toward the steep
Heaven whom she child's us by.

One of Hopkins's contemporaries has suggested that had he known him outside the Jesuit Order he would not have believed that so speculative and original an intellect could have brought itself to submit to authority. Humanly speaking, it would have been impossible. But Gerard Hopkins was as powerful in his humility as in his intellect and he had the vision of the Host. In the superb simplicity of his devotion to the Eucharist there was something of that particular *décor* of sanctity which characterized Pius X, conscious always of the abiding presence of the Holy Ghost as informant of, and inspirer towards, the Tabernacle, and through the Tabernacle to all creatures :

Because the Holy Ghost over the bent
World broods with warm breast and with ah ! bright wings.

Those magical lines are taken from his "God's Grandeur" and convey the amazing articulate hush which always lies in and behind the dramatic happening, be it the Mass or a sunset, or the great bird-loud glory of a sunrise that is full of Christmas angels heralding the day's finality of

Thee, God, I come from, to thee go,
All day long I like fountain flow
From thy hand out, swayed about
Note-like in thy mighty glow.

A beautifully firm, lapidary quatrain containing within its small precious stone the whole starlight and moonlight of Francis Thompson's "Hound of Heaven". This remarkable ability for condensation is not least among Hopkins's many qualifications as a poet. The same power is evident, too, in his prose, and it may be useful here to quote a passage from his notes, not only because it is characteristic but because it helps us a step further towards an appreciation of his sensibility and the direction taken by his whole emotive life. The prose, it will be noted, is essentially that of a poet.

First saw the Northern Lights. My eye was caught by beams of light and dark very like the crown of horny rays the sun makes behind a cloud. At first I thought of silvery cloud until I saw that these were more luminous and did not dim the clearness of the stars in the Bear. They rose slightly radiating thrown out from the earth line. Then I saw soft pulses of light one after another rise and pass upwards arched in shape but waveringly and with the arch broken. They seemed to float, not following the warp of the sphere as falling stars look to do but free though concentric with it. This busy working of nature, wholly independent of the earth and seeming to go on in a strain of time not reckoned by our reckoning of days and years but simpler and as if correcting the preoccupation of the world by being preoccupied with and appealing to, and dated to, the day of judgment, was like a new witness to God and filled me with delightful fear.

And as an example of his swift poetic insight it would be hard to find, even among his poems, anything lovelier or more acute than the following, also taken from his prose notes :

A lunar halo : I looked at it from the upstairs library window. It was a grave grained sky, the strands rising a little from left to right. The halo was not quite round, for in the first place it was a little pulled and drawn below, by the refraction of the lower air perhaps, but what is more it fell on the nether left-hand side to rhyme the moon itself, which was not quite at full. I could not but strongly feel in my fancy the old instress of this, the moon leaning on her side, as if fallen back, in the cheerful light floor within the ring, after with magic rightness and success tracing round her the ring, the steady copy of her own outline. But this sober

grey darkness and pale light was happily broken through by the orange of the pealing of Milton bells.

It is from such revealing little extracts that it is possible for the student of poetry to approach with greater confidence the more difficult—but no less strong and lucid—verse of Hopkins. For the student has learned something of the poet's individual vision, of his manner of seeing and hearing. He can meet the unexpected without being bewildered. It is in the sonnet form that Hopkins's technique may best be studied, for he revolutionized the form and is more at home in it than in any other. The famous "The Windhover", dedicated "To Christ Our Lord", is, perhaps, the finest and most typical example. The poet himself regarded it as his masterpiece.

I caught this morning morning's minion, Kingdom of daylight's
dauphin, dapple-dawn-drawn Falcon, in his riding
Of the rolling level underneath him steady air, and striding
High there, how he rung upon the rein of a wimpling wing
In his ecstasy! then off, off forth on swing,
As a skate's heel sweeps smooth on a bow-bend: the hurl and
gliding
Rebuffed the big wind. My heart in hiding
Stirred for a bird,—the achieve of, the mastery of the thing!

Brute beauty and valour and act, oh, air, pride, plume, here
Buckle! and the fire that breaks from thee then, a billion
Times told lovelier, more dangerous, O my chevalier!

No wonder of it; shéer plód makes plough down sillion
Shine, and blue-beak embers, ah my dear,
Fall, gall themselves, and gash gold-vermilion.

There is an extraordinary atmosphere of worship in that poem and an ecstasy of amazement at the wonder of created things. There is nothing in literature quite like it. It is only at a second or third reading that the poem really begins to reveal itself. The ear, becoming accustomed to the riding metre, suddenly listens to the whirring wings of the Windhover not merely conquering

the air but blindly praising God. In Shelley's "Ode to a Skylark" we get a picture perfect in its fashion and fashioning, but here we have something less remote and impersonal, essentially the poem of a mystic who identifies himself with the morning and, priest-wise, enters the holy of holies to recognize and to embrace the meaning of creation. The sprung rhythm, characteristically employed, is exactly right. Impossible to conceive of any use of word and sound more appropriate to the instress of the morning: abrupt notes in the broad saturating music of myriads of birds chanting their lauds, sharp black trees everywhere silhouetted like upward-thrust beaks against the flushed heavens, a church spire over there and all the world little with tiny peaks and lumps and fine hairs fringing the immense expanse of the sky's forehead. In that scene—which is but for a moment attendant on the eternal weight of glory—Hopkins saw the Windhover not merely as a bird but as a symbol and even the microcosm of creation in all its energy and strength, proposing, praising, and sealing belief in a personal and lovable Creator. Given the outlook of a layman, a secular priest, a Benedictine or an Oratorian, Gerard Hopkins might have written such a poem, but certainly he would not have given us the Windhover as we know it. No one, even those with but an outside and amateur knowledge of the Ignatian exercises, can very well fail to perceive that a certain mode of language—simultaneously disciplined and wildly free—has been moulded in the gymnasium, both spiritual and physical, of the Company of Jesus. And supposedly even good Jesuits—in their humility and activity—fail to realize the almost indelible mark which is laid on their public speech by those very exercises. And that mark, at its most luminous, has the lapidary quality of poetry proper: hard in the shadow, gracious in the light; the reverse, in fact, of some aspects of the natural phenomenon, but thereby vigorously creative and having a beauty which was born in Loyola and conceived in Bethlehem.

From this point we may proceed to a first-class literary problem which will be discussed, *ad nauseam*, by many generations of critics from one aspect or another. There is

not space here to give more than one or two suggestions concerning it. The problem is this. Gerard Hopkins differed from most poets in that—despite his lack of convention—he studied the mechanics of verse too academically. He was concerned—almost to the point of exaggeration—with the precise framework on which his verse was to be built, and were it not for the remarkable fact that no whisper of the self-conscious or the artificial disturbed any of the work to which he himself or his more competent critics have attached any importance, one would have accused him of being more indebted to his architectural craftsmanship than to the emotive and creative powers of the poet. Speaking generally, it is true to say that the finest poets have had very little academic knowledge of prosody and have almost invariably relied on ear and eye for verse values and quantities. In short, they have not studied but rather have provided the material for study. The student measures with his rule, and the poet as accurately with his eye. We must be content, it seems, to allow that Hopkins was an exception and grant him “poetic licence” for his unobtrusive if somewhat sombre and highly inconsistent scholarship in this direction. At the same time it should be remembered that he was a pioneer and experimentalist, which explains, to no small extent, his deliberate etymological and scientific approach to verse. He was also a musician, who is—more often than not—as nearly related to the mathematician as to the poet. Add to these his flair for liturgical precision and the exercises he pursued as a Jesuit—particularly in the novitiate—and some glimpse of the background of his method may be gained, a method which, in his case, proved eminently successful and appropriate to his own intellectual and sensory vision of creation. In fact he had a vocation and found it.

As it would be unjust to measure the rarity of his spiritual life by ordinary ascetic standards, and his esoteric artistic conceptions by usual aesthetic standards, so it would be equally unjust to treat his craftsmanship and profound knowledge of prosody as anything but natural and admirable and as one of the most significant contributions in history to the English literary tradition. Again

it must be remembered that the study of rhetoric formed part of his preparation in the novitiate, and this involved, willy-nilly, not merely the knowledge possessed, but the "muscling-up" of that knowledge. An interesting and typical example of his method is found among his lecture notes written at Roehampton. It is on "Kinds of Verse" and runs as follows :

Verse wholly or partially repeats the same figure of sound—this explained. Verse then is speech wholly or partially repeating the same figure of sound. Partially as *Jam satis terris nivis atque dirae*—that is | - ∪ - - | - ∪ - - | ∪ - -, for the common measure ∪ (= $\frac{1}{2}$ -) is repeated throughout, wholly when you add *Grandinis misit Pater et rubente* ; or partially, taking the whole stanza, for it repeats the same figure for three lines but gives up in the fourth, but wholly if you take two stanzas. More clearly such an iambic as this ∪ ∪ -' | ∪ -' | - ∪ ∪ | ∪ ∪ ∪ | - -' | ∪ ∪ -' is a partial repetition only, for this is verse though you did not add another line, this is a whole repetition : - ∪ -' | ∪ -' | ∪ -' | ∪ -' | ∪ -' | ∪ -' |.

Verse distinguished from music. It is speech because we must distinguish it from music which is not verse. Music is composition which wholly or partially repeats the same figure of pitched sound (it is the aftering of pitched sound). Verse must be spoken or capable of being spoken.

Running or intermittent repetition of the figure. The figure may be repeated runningly, continuously, as in rhythm (ABABAB) or intermittently, as in alliteration and rhyme (ABCDABEFABGH). The former gives more tone, *candorem*, style, chasteness ; the latter more brilliancy, starriness, quain, margaretting.

It would be impossible to imagine Shakespeare or Keats or even Blake or Donne solemnly writing notes on words and rhythm in that manner, even if an academic study of rhetoric had been compulsory in their adult life. One suspects they would either have rebelled or laughed irreverently, though they would certainly have agreed with Hopkins's conclusions.

Judging from the long correspondence on the subject of verse technique which passed between Hopkins and Robert Bridges over a number of years, we begin to understand how the two poets constantly encouraged each other in the pursuit of experiment in versification. Both were enthusiasts. They were living and working

at a period when English poetry was in a transitional stage—as it still is—and saw not only the opportunities but the necessity of introducing a new element into what was tending to become set and sterile in some respects and loose and unlicensed in others. The passing of the Romantics and the pre-Raphaelites was beginning to provide a dramatic situation in the world of letters. Bridges and Hopkins were to bring about the anti-climax. What the climax will be we do not yet know; that it will come is certain, but present tendencies seem to indicate something in the nature of a reaction. And we do not yet know what the intense Thomist revival of the present day is about to give us, nor to what extent it will influence letters in general and English poetry in particular. Perhaps—and how amusing it would be!—it will now prove the turn of the sons of St. Dominic to give a rival to the son of St. Ignatius.

Finally, it is interesting to speculate on the influence which Gerard Hopkins will exercise, in the future, on the trend of the English tradition. Much has been written about his influence at the present time, but it is not nearly so extensive or real as is generally supposed. Certainly our contemporary Catholic poets seem to be hardly aware of so recent a force. They are—for the most part—engaged in developing and Catholicizing a revival of pre-Raphaelitism. Ironically enough it is among the Neo-Pagan and achristian writers of the present year of grace that we find the Hopkins method most in evidence, but even in that coterie it is of extremely doubtful strength. The genuine Hopkins technique, it seems, cannot thrive apart from the philosophy to which it is so intimately bound. A Spender or a Day Lewis may never attain to “the achieve of, the mastery of the thing!” this side of the tomb, because they live outside the Catholic philosophy and are inexperienced in the sacramental life. What then of our Catholic poets? The answer is that there is not one, so far as we know, of any real distinction who is living a cloistered life or under the rule of a religious Order, though several are certainly of eminent sanctity.

EGERTON CLARKE.

THE ROMANTIC HELLENIST

THE golden rule "Nothing in Excess", inscribed over the portals at Delphi, was often disregarded by the Greeks and is never observed by the more romantic Hellenists. "The Greeks", writes a famous Hellenist, "are the authors of the most beautiful statues, the most beautiful poems, the most beautiful buildings in the world." So much for Shakespeare, Michael Angelo, and Chartres. It would be easy to multiply similar quotations in which Greece is praised without the least hint of that Greek restraint which our Hellenists profess to admire. Nor is this surprising, for the romantic Hellenist is in love with Pallas Athene, and we do not ask a lover to be restrained in praise of his mistress.

"Why can't these Hellenists be content", we are asked, "to find beauty in Aeschylus and the Parthenon without for ever seeking to rank Greek things first and the rest nowhere?" All of which sounds very reasonable. . . . But you will learn many things about the Middle Ages from a fanatic like Ruskin who was grossly unfair to the Renaissance, and many things about Greece from some passionate enthusiast who shares the eighteenth-century distaste for the Gothic, which you would never learn from balanced folk who are equally moved (or unmoved) by the Aegina pediments and the statuary of the Porte Royale of Chartres Cathedral. We must be grateful to our enthusiasts even when, as in the case of the more romantic Hellenists, they are unfair to the very culture which produced them. *Produced* them . . . that is the point, for romantic Hellenism is a synthetic product of Hellenic and Christian culture, and those who are in unconscious revolt against this tradition are unconsciously affected by it and inevitably see Greece through Christian spectacles.

The tendency to read back the romanticism of the West into the matter-of-fact directness of classical Greek is not altogether absent from one of the most fascinating modern studies of Hellenism, Sir Richard Livingstone's *The Greek Genius and its Meaning to Us*. Sir Richard is not the victim of a complex which warps the judgement

of so many Hellenists, the unconscious desire to belittle the contribution of Palestine to our Western culture. He does not forget Jerusalem, and is fully alive to the defects of Hellenistic humanism. The subject of Greek religion is complex and difficult, but broadly speaking it is surely true, as Sir Richard Livingstone remarks, that "whereas God is a conclusion to the Greek, to the Hebrew he is the main premise". Man is the hero of Greek literature. "There are many wonderful things," writes Sophocles, "and the most wonderful is man." But God is the hero of the Bible. "Lord, what is man that Thou art mindful of him, or the son of man that Thou visitest him?"

The humanist keeps his eyes on solid earth, and is in touch with concrete reality, but he misses many things which are revealed to those to whom the heavens declare the glory of God. Indeed, I think Sir Richard Livingstone might have carried his comparison still further. He might have compared not only the religions of Greece and Palestine but the literatures which those religions produced. Even the most ardent worshipper of Pallas Athene would perhaps admit under pressure of cross-examination that Hellas has given us no poetry to compare with the best things in Job, in Isaiah, and in the Song of Solomon, and no stories to match the great stories in the Old Testament and in the New. There is nothing in Homer to rival the humanity, insight, realism, and dramatic power with which the life story of David is unfolded; and it is to David's lament over Jonathan that those who admire the more idealistic forms of Greek friendship turn for the supreme expression of this friendship in literature. The superiority of the Bible, judged solely as literature, is a superiority of spiritual insight. The vision of the Hebrew was more penetrating than the vision of the Greek.

Again, the contrast between Aeschylus and Shakespeare is largely due to the contrast between their respective philosophies. Shakespeare's work is permeated by the Christian belief in the supreme importance of the individual soul, whereas Aeschylus is more interested in situations than in personalities. Man, as Mr. Lowes

Dickinson remarks, is the true hero of Greek tragedy: Tom, Dick, or Harry of the modern novel. The mask which the Greek player used to conceal personality is a profoundly significant symbol. The implicit conclusions of Shakespearean drama are expressible in terms of Christian philosophy. Lear, for instance—as my brother, Hugh Kingsmill, remarks—symbolizes the tragedy of trying to find love in the creature rather than in the creator; Macbeth symbolizes the attempt to find satisfaction in the assertion rather than in the conquest of the will to power. One can believe—as I certainly do believe—that the corpus of Western literature, both prose and poetry, has nothing to fear from comparison with Greek literature; and yet concede that Greek literature has been one of the major influences in the formation of Western culture. We owe an immense debt to the Greeks for the standards which they set.

The outstanding virtue of Greek literature is, perhaps, the note of directness—and nowhere is the contrast between the classical Greeks and the modern Hellenists more apparent than in this matter of directness. It is beyond dispute that Greek literature is delightfully free from humbug, insincerity, false sentiment, and false heroics. The Greeks—to take one instance—fought bravely, but seldom pretended to enjoy fighting. The Greek soldier in one of Plato's Dialogues remarks that brave men and cowards are equally depressed at the approach of the enemy and equally elated at his departure. Sir Richard Livingstone quotes as an example of Greek directness the lament of the Argive mother who has lost her son, and who expresses her regret that the agony of travail has proved to be unprofitable since "I have none to feed my old age". The Greek mother goes straight to the point, the seriousness of losing the family breadwinner. Death is the supreme touchstone of sincerity, and on this theme Greek directness is most effective, particularly in contrast with Roman literature. Seneca prosed on interminably in the hope of allaying his own fears, and only once does he face up to the reality with one sudden outburst of sincerity with which he reacts from his own special pleadings. *Et adversus mortem tu*

tam minute jacularis. Lucretius, noblest of all the poets of scepticism, spoils the austere beauty of the concluding lines of his third book by a false analogy intended to be consoling. Horace takes refuge in wistful sentiment. But Aristotle goes to the point with Greek directness. "For death it is a dreadful thing. It is the end." "The life to which I belong uses me", writes Mr. H. G. Wells, "and will pass on beyond me, and I am content." Mr. Wells escapes from reality into the mists of sentimental metaphor, but the old Greek faces the fact like a man.

Nothing, again, could have been less sentimental than the Greek attitude to nature. Nature seems romantic to the modern because the modern is in revolt against the artificialities of industrial civilization, but to the man who can wring only a bare livelihood from the grudging soil there is nothing so romantic as the artificial security of town life. Homer, as Ruskin pointed out, appreciated nature in so far—and only in so far—as nature was subservient to human ends. What he really liked was a well-ploughed field, a shady grove, a fountain or a stream running through arid country. The one natural force which provoked his enthusiasm was rain. Those who know Greece in summer will understand why. There are many oblique references to mountains in Homer and none more revealing than the statement that mountains are covered with mists, which are "bad for shepherds and better than night for thieves". To Homer, rain was the friend of good men, and mountain mist the ally of thieves. Pindar is a slightly more hopeful quarry for the nature-lover, but there is a world of difference between the neutral and colourless references to mountains, valleys, and the sea which you find in Pindar and the passionate nature love which inspires Western nature lyrics. The attribution of personality to natural objects, an attitude which is born of nature worship, is almost unknown in Greek poetry. The Greek may have peopled his woods with dryads, but this was only—as Mr. Ridley shrewdly remarks—because the Greek mind saw the fountain and the hill as one thing and the naiad or oread as quite another thing. "If one imagines",

says Mr. Ridley, "a being dwelling in a fountain, it is because one does not think of the fountain as a being at all." "The Greek", as Mr. Chesterton somewhere remarks, "could not see the wood for the dryads."

The Hellenist, when he has scraped together an uninspiring collection of impersonal references to "shadowy mountain", "meadows by the grey sea", and the like, is uneasily conscious of the contrast between these bleak phrases and the authentic note of nature love. He accordingly plays the trump card of Greek restraint. Pallas Athene, we are given to understand, was a regular Wordsworthian; but the lady was too well bred to rhapsodize in the Wordsworthian style. The Hellenist, however, forgets that the Greeks did rhapsodize about things which provoked their admiration—such as physical bravery and masculine beauty. The coldness with which they referred to the beauty of nature should be compared with the enthusiasm of their references to the beauty of the human body.

Neo-Hellenism is the product of the Romantic Revival. The nature-loving, romantic, mystical Greek was born within the sound of Bow Bells. It is we who read romance into the simplest statement of unadorned fact. Pater, for instance, assures us that the Greek touched even the familiar incidents of life with beauty, and he quotes in support of this thesis these lines from a Greek poet :

When they came within the deep harbour they furled their sails and laid them in the dark ship, and themselves disembarked on the beach of the sea.

But these lines are not, as Pater implies, a beautiful description of a familiar incident, but a commonplace description of a beautiful incident. Pater read these lines and saw the shapely Greek ship sailing into some blue harbour of the Aegean when the world was young, and because sails filled with wind are lovelier than funnels filled with smoke, and because a natural harbour is more beautiful than the docks of Liverpool, Pater—who was in unconscious revolt against Victorian industrialism—read into these lines a romance which the Greek poet never

felt and a beauty which the Greek poet never saw. The poet, indeed, had added little to the curt catalogue of obvious facts which a child might have noted and which a child might have reported. Translate what he saw into modern terms and we have a cross-Channel steamer entering Folkestone harbour.

The sailors put down the gangway, and the landing-officer said, "Have your passports ready please." And the seasick passengers passed into the Customs shed.

Similarly, Tennyson reads back into Ulysses the *wanderlust* of the domesticated Victorian. Tennyson's Ulysses soon grows weary of family life, and longs to start again on his adventures.

For my purpose holds
To sail beyond the sunset and the baths
Of all the western stars, until I die.
It may be that the gulfs will wash us down :
It may be we shall touch the Happy Isles,
And see the great Achilles, whom we knew.

Homer's Ulysses would never have left his beloved Ithaca. The romance of the *Odyssey* is the romance of comfort won at the price of peril and hardship, not the romance of perilous wandering. Swinburne, who posed as a great Hellenist, would have been very ill at ease had he been transported to Periclean Athens. His own Atalanta would have been far more at home in Putney than in Calydon.

Me the snows
That face the first o' the morning, and cold hills
Full of the land-wind and sea-travelling storms
And many a wandering wing of noisy nights,
That know the thunder and hear the thickening wolves . . .
Me these allure.

"Allure"? Snow, cold hills, storm, thunder, wolves? These things may have seemed alluring in the security of "The Pines", but the Greek reader would have been repelled by this catalogue of romantic discomforts.

English translations from Greek originals provide many interesting contrasts between the true Hellenic

and the romantic Hellenic attitude. Andromache's lament over Hector is characteristic in its directness and freedom from humbug. "In you I had a husband sufficient for me in wisdom and in birth, and great in riches and in courage." Wise, well born, rich, and brave—clearly the ideal husband. This is what Professor Gilbert Murray makes of the Greek catalogue of marital perfections.

O my Hector ! best beloved,
That being mine wast all in all to me.
My prince, my wise one, O my majesty
Of valiance . . .

Andromache mourning over Hector has become Queen Victoria sighing over Albert the Good. Those of us who do not believe that human genius flowered once and for all in Periclean Athens are often accused of being biased against the Greeks. Such charges are not surprising, for those who are in love with Pallas Athene are irritated by the respectful admirer who stops short this side of idolatry. But surely we may glory in the splendour of the Greek mind and yet believe that Hellas only found its soul in Christianity. The romantic Hellenists have been guilty of disservice to Hellas by restricting the term Hellenism to the Hellenism of classical Greece; for Santa Sophia is as much a product of the Greek genius as the Parthenon, and it is to this noble synthesis, the synthesis of classical and Christian Hellenism, that we owe the supreme achievements of the Greek genius: the Fourth Gospel, Santa Sophia, and the mosaics at Ravenna.

It is impossible to exaggerate the debt which the world owes to the Hellenism which includes within its range not only Aristotle but St. John, for the words which were spoken at a Greek funeral many years ago are true not only of the soldiers who died for Athens but of all those who have laboured to extend the empire of Hellas over the minds of men :

Their story is graven not on stone but lives on without visible symbol, woven into the very fabric of other men's lives.

ARNOLD LUNN.

CARDINAL POLE'S EIRENIKON

[To the distraught religious groups of this country, and indeed of the world, we venture to offer this translation of an historic address delivered at the Second Session of the Council of Trent, Thursday, 7 January, 1546. Cardinal Pole sat with Cardinals Del Monte and Corvini as legate of the Pope. There was little in the number or dignity of the assembled Council to still the fears enkindled in Pole's heart by the religious upheaval of his beloved country. In answer to the Pope's summons, and after years of negotiation and preparation, the great Churches of the West had sent to the Council but four cardinals, four archbishops, and twenty-six bishops: in all a group of thirty-four.

If the numbers of the assembled bishops did not make for hope, still less did the seeming attitude of the assembly. At the opening Session, 13 December, 1545, the Bishop of Bitonto, Cornelio Mussi, gave the official first address to the Council. Couched in the somewhat academic Latin of the Renaissance, it was little more than the usual superlative and empty praise of the Pope, the Emperor, the King of France, and other secular princes. What we know of the English Cardinal would hardly lead us to suppose that these commonplaces of Renaissance compliment would soothe or reassure a heart suffering from the martyrdom of his mother and of his Mother Church.

The five and twenty days of silence between this address and the address of Pole no doubt veil the dramatic discussions between the three Papal legates of whom Pole was personally, though not officially, the chief. That drama issues in an official entry in the diary of one of the Secretaries: "Then I (Angelus Mascarelli) Secretary of the Sacred Council in the name of the aforesaid Most Reverend and Most Illustrious Lords Presidents and Legates, read aloud the admonition and exhortation to the Fathers." Another diarist has recorded the immediate effect of this address. Hardly had ten sentences been read when all eyes were turned to Pole and all were wondering why Pole himself was not reading what all felt to be an address worthy of a great epoch-making Council.

So many defeats have been inflicted upon divided

Christendom that many eyes are turning towards the divine ideal of religious unity. From the past read with bitterness men can recover what leads to still further embitterment. But this historic outpouring of a chastened Christ-like heart is too precious a heritage from a century of hatred and estrangement be withheld from a century that desires above all else the unity and strength and peace that can now be reached only through the reconciliations of Charity.

VINCENT McNABB, O.P.]

MOST reverend Fathers, etc.

As the matters to be dealt with in this sacred Congress for God's glory and the Church's good increased, we* who bore the office of Presidents and Legates of the Apostolic See thought it our bounden duty often to use words of exhortation or of warning. Nor must we change our way in this second Session, which, we hope, has been given as a happy beginning to the Council.

All the more willingly shall we fulfil this duty because when we exhort you to do what befits so great a gathering or on the contrary warn you, we are exhorting or warning ourselves, who are in the same bark with you, and are exposed with you to the same dangers and the same storms. We bestir ourselves, I say, to watch lest, on the one hand, we run on the rocks which certainly are all too many in these matters, or on the other hand by our sloth we are storm-beaten and wrecked by the very flood of affairs; but rather steadied by faith and hope we may steer our course where the harbour of safety may most clearly show itself to the glory of God in Christ Jesus.

Therefore, that we may begin as we should, all be warned in this beginning: each of us should above all things keep before his eyes the things that are expected of this holy Council. Each one will easily see therein what is the duty resting upon him. To put it briefly, these duties are what are contained in the Bull summoning the Council, viz. the uprooting of heresies, the reformation of ecclesiastical discipline and of morals, and lastly the external peace of the whole Church. These are the things we must see to, or rather for which we

* The address, though composed by Cardinal Pole, has the authority of the three Papal legates.

must untiringly pray in order that by God's mercy they may be done. This again, at the outset of the Council and before all else, must be made an admonition to each and all of us who have here forgathered—and especially to us who are presiding in this sacred office—lest at any time we should think the many ills now oppressing the flock of Christ could be withstood either by any one of us who have come here or by the whole Council, even if all the pastors of the whole earth were met. If, indeed, we think the thing can be accomplished by us, or by any other than by Christ Himself, whom God the Father has made the sole Saviour and Shepherd and to whom He has given all power, we shall err in the very foundation of all our actions, and we shall provoke still further the divine wrath.

To the former evils which have come upon us because we left the well of living waters, we shall have added the greater sin of wishing to heal these ills by our own power or prudence, so that justly it may be said of us what the prophet in the Name of God spoke in accusation of the chosen people: "This people hath wrought two evils. They have left Me, the well of living water, and they have dug to themselves cisterns that cannot hold water." (Jer. ii, 13.) These cisterns are all the counsels which spring from our prudence without the breathing of the divine Spirit. They cannot hold the people in godliness and obedience as cisterns hold water. But the more we toil to pen the waters by these devices the more rapidly and flood-like shall they flow from us and leave us. This may we learn from our experience in many places and in these latter years. And this may warn us that there is one only way left for curing these ills. First we must acknowledge that all our remedies are useless, and indeed are more powerful to strengthen than to destroy these evils. Secondly, we who have the office of Fathers must act in everything by faith and hope and place our trust in the power of Christ, whom God the Father calls His right hand, and in the Wisdom of Christ, who is the Wisdom of the Father, whose ministers in all things we acknowledge ourselves to be.

"But in this", says the Apostle, "it is required among

stewards that a man be found faithful." (1 Cor. iv, 2.) Our present duty is to show ourselves sufficient ministers in all things. But we shall be sufficient only if we think ourselves, as of ourselves, altogether insufficient. "*For who*", says the Apostle, "*is sufficient for these things?*" For we are not sufficient to think *anything of ourselves as of ourselves.*" (2 Cor. iii, 5.)

Yet to acknowledge this is not enough for us. The Apostle could say this, and through this gate enter into his work's accomplishment and show himself a faithful and sufficient minister. Yet at the same time he could say, speaking of his ministry, "*I am not conscious of anything against myself.*" (1 Cor. iv, 4.) But if we are to speak the truth we cannot do otherwise than confess that we are conscious of having been greatly wanting in fulfilling the duties imposed on us; and indeed of having in no small part been the cause of the very evils we have been summoned to mend. But it is not enough to confess here that we are unequal to such a burden.

What, then, shall we do that we now be sufficient ministers of Christ in renewing the Church? The self-same thing that Christ, the Shepherd of our souls, did when He came to found and form His Church. The self-same, indeed, Fathers, must be done by us that the very Wisdom of the Father did when He came to lead many children into glory; this indeed ought again to be our purpose. For when He found all burdened by sins, He took upon Himself all the sins of all—in the sight of God He made Himself for all the one culprit and offender. He bore all the penalty due to us as if He had committed all the misdeeds and sins we had committed. Yet He was wholly untainted by any sin, since "He had done no sin nor was guile ever found on His lips." (1 Peter ii, 22.)

Therefore what, in His great love of God the Father and in His mercifulness towards our race, Christ did, justice itself now enacts of us that we should do. Before the tribunal of God's mercy we, the shepherds, should make ourselves responsible for all the evils now burdening the flock of Christ. The sins of all we should take upon ourselves, not in generosity but in justice; because the truth is that of these evils we are in great part the cause,

and therefore we should implore the divine mercy through Jesus Christ.

If any should think that in calling ourselves, who are the shepherds, a cause of the evils burdening the Church, we are using undue bitterness and exaggeration of speech, rather than the truth, facts themselves which cannot lie will bear us witness. Let us therefore scan for a moment the evils burdening the Church and, at the same time, our own sins.

Yet who can count these sins? Like the other evils, they outnumber the sands of the sea-shore and raise their voice to the very heavens. We must therefore narrow this so great a mass of evils within the limits set by this Council itself, which is called to cure the greatest of them, viz. the three we have named above: (1) Heresy, (2) The decline in ecclesiastical morals, and (3) Internal and external war.

Since the Church has been beset for many years by these woes, let us now look and think what is their source—and if we gave them birth or increase. Consider, then, the birth of these heresies which in these days are everywhere rife. We may indeed wish to deny that we have given them birth, because we ourselves have not uttered any heresy. Nevertheless, wrong opinions about faith, like brambles and thorns, have sprung up in the God's-garth entrusted to us. Hence, even if, as is their wont, these poisonous weeds have spread of themselves, nevertheless if we have not tilled our field as we ought—if we have not sowed—if we took no pains at once to root up the springing weeds—we are no less to be reckoned their cause than if we ourselves had sowed them; and all the more since all these have their beginning and increase in the tiller's sloth. Here, therefore, the tillers of God's-garth should examine themselves, should question their conscience what pains they have taken in tilling and sowing. Whoever will do this, especially in these days when so few have a care to till God's-garth, will, we think, have no doubt that the guilt of these heresies spreading in the Church is upon him. But we have said enough by way of warning about what comes under the first heading.

Let us come to the second, which embraces the

breaking-down of right living and what is called "abuses". Herein no good is served by a long inquiry as to who are the causes of these evils, seeing that we cannot even name any other causes but ourselves!

Therefore let us approach the third, which embraces in itself the hindrances to the Church's peace, as wars domestic or external. These, indeed, have already disturbed and still disturb the Church's peace. We will say of them that if these wars are (and God shows by most sure signs that they are) His scourges to chasten us because we cannot deny that we are guilty under the two former heads—even of these wars we cannot deny that we ourselves are the chief cause. We are of opinion that God sends these scourges to punish our sinning and to turn our gaze towards these very sins by which we greatly offend His majesty.

Here, if anyone would estimate in what ways the Church has been troubled by war, let him deliberate within himself what are those things especially in which the Church suffers most because of wars. Nor does it matter whose wars they are—whether the intestine wars of our own princes, or the external wars of the Turks which in past years have wrought such havoc on us, or of those who have given up obedience to their shepherds and indeed have driven them from their sees. In a word, all that is to be said of every kind of war, whether men have taken up arms against us, have driven the shepherds from their churches, have thrown the Orders into confusion, have set laymen in the place of bishops, have robbed Church property, have hindered the preaching of God's Word, we may sum up in this: if they are willing to read the Book of the Abuses of Shepherds, the greater number of those who claim this name will find it stated in the clearest terms that there is none of these things which has not been done by themselves. It will be found that our ambition, our avarice, our cupidity have wrought all these evils on the people of God; and that, on account of this, shepherds are being driven from their churches, and the churches starved of the Word of God, and the property of the Church, which is the property of the poor, stolen, and the priesthood given to the unworthy and to

those who differ from lay-folk only in dress (if even in that !). Which of these things can we deny having done during these latter years ? If then the Turks and the heretics do the same to us, what else are we witnessing than our crimes and at the same time the just judgement of God—a judgement, indeed, full of mercy ? If He punished us as we deserved, we should have been long since as Sodom and Gomorrha.

Why do we recall these things ? To shame you ? Far from it ; but rather, my beloved Fathers and brethren, to admonish you—and our own selves first of all—how to avoid these scourges which now rain on us, and even greater evils which await us unless we repent ; so that we may escape God's fearful judgement—fearful indeed to those who will not repent and especially to those who hold authority. "For a most severe judgement shall be for them that bear rule." (Wisdom vi, 6.) We see judgement beginning with the house of God. Now that the priests are cast out and trodden underfoot, what does this signify if not the divine judgement on us ? This is what Christ foretold in saying that His priests are *the salt of the earth*, but that *if the salt lose its savour it is good for nothing more than to be cast out and to be trodden underfoot*. (Matt. v, 13.) All these things we are now suffering. If like our fathers we were suffering for justice' sake, we should be blessed. But because the salt has lost its savour we are suffering justly yet not for the sake of justice.

In all these afflictions of ours we see God's judgement—but would that we did see His judgement ; it would be the first step towards avoiding all God's judgements and scourges and of entering into grace and true glory. This has been our motive for somewhat sharply and lengthily recalling these things. Unless indeed these things are well known and seen to, it is useless to enter this Council, and useless to call upon the Holy Spirit, who is wont to make His first step in men's souls when men condemn themselves so that they may afterwards condemn the world of sin. Therefore unless this Spirit first condemns us before ourselves we cannot profess that He has yet come to us ; nor will He come if we refuse to hear about our own sinfulness.

To us will be said what was said by the prophet Ezekiel to the people of God when, overlooking their sins, they sought an answer from God through the prophet: "There came men of the ancients of Israel to inquire of the Lord and they sat before Me. . . . Thus saith the Lord God, Are you come to inquire of me? As I live, I will not answer you, saith the Lord." And then: "If thou judgest them declare to them the abominations of their fathers." (Ezek. xx, 1-4.) In these words God shows why He would not answer them, because they had not yet heard the abominations both of themselves and of their fathers. Now it is the same Spirit of God who at that time gave this reply and whom we now invoke as we sit before the Lord. Therefore from these words you see both what we must do to have a favourable answer, and at the same time how necessary it is that we who preside at this holy Council should begin our words with an unveiling of our sins.

But because we now see some not only bitterly bewailing in the first place their own sins and those of our Order, but also beseeching the divine mercy, we greatly hope that the Spirit Whom we have called upon has come to us. We have this greatest pledge of the divine mercy, this very opening of a Council to which we have come for the setting-up and rebuilding of the almost ruined Church, as the old Church, after its long captivity abroad, came back to Jerusalem to rebuild the Temple. In the state of this people in their glad home-coming and their rebuilding of the Temple we can see an image of our time and of our doings, especially in this Council. Moreover, in the example of this people's leaders may be seen your duty, who are the leaders of God's people wayfaring towards their home in heaven.

We beseech you, therefore, often to recall what is written in the books of Ezra, of Nehemiah, and of Daniel. There are recorded all these leaders' plans, which always had one aim, namely by confessing and repenting of their own, their people's, and their fathers' sins they might move all to beseech the divine mercy. When the people did this all things went well. If then we seek and await a happy ending and outcome to our

rebuilding of the Church—and for this we have gladly assembled in the Spirit here—we must take the same counsels; and all the more because they had but a Temple to rebuild, but we a Church. If many strove to keep them from carrying their work through—if many, unable to thwart the work, held them to scorn—let us be persuaded that there will be no lack of scorers and of those who will do their best to frighten and withdraw us from the work we have begun. Not only is our struggle with flesh and blood but with “spirits of wickedness in the high places”. Yet stronger than all these is He in whose name we have undertaken this work. Let us then put our trust in Him; and let our prayers call upon Him that He Himself may bring all to an end.

This Council, as having the character of consultors and judges, will both consult about whatever has to do with the Church's well-being and will judge both of things and of persons; for we sit as judging the twelve tribes of Israel, in which are comprised the whole people of God. Hence it is now the time for warning ourselves against what is wont to weaken in us the power of consulting or judging. These are the passions of the soul. They are also called “perturbations” because they disturb and swerve the right and true judgement and feeling about things. These passions especially are to be shunned which, as the pagan wisely warns us,* should be cast aside in counsel-taking, when he says, “Every man that would consult about things doubtful should be free from anger, hatred, friendship.” For all classes of men are prone to this; and those especially who serve princes. They have strong affection, they easily speak for love or for hate, according as they think their princes are affected, from whom they await reward.

But when we speak of princes—and we speak both of ecclesiastical princes and secular—we acknowledge and rejoice that we have princes who are Christians. This our fathers neither of the old nor of the early Church had. Yet always and above all things this Council must remember that this is the place for praising no one but only God in Christ Jesus, and for justifying Him alone;

* Sallust, *Catiline*, ch. 51.

but for condemning all classes of men and, first of all, myself, who am now speaking, so that we may say with Daniel :

“O Lord, to us is confusion of face, to our princes and to our fathers who have sinned.

“But to Thee, O Lord our God, mercy and forgiveness, for we have departed from Thee.

“And we have not hearkened to the voice of the Lord our God, to walk in His law, which He set before us by His servants the prophets.

“And all Israel have transgressed Thy law and have turned away from hearing Thy voice. And on us is the malediction and the curse.” (Dan. ix, 8, 11.)

Here therefore is the place for us to follow the example of this prophet, whose words we have just read, by confessing before God and His Church not only our own sins (we who are priests) but also the sins of the people and of the princes ; and by interceding for all. For Daniel said : “Now while I was yet speaking and praying and confessing my sins and the sins of my people”. (Dan. ix, 20.) The word “people” here embraces all classes of person, as is clear from what we have already repeated of his confessions.

In this matter it clearly appears what is to be done by us who have forgathered here to save the Church from the great evils that overwhelm it. We must confess our own sins and those of the princes and the people. This we are now fitly doing in a spirit of sorrow. But we should do it even more fully in word, if these princes were present to join with us in confessing and weeping. For as the prophets say, the sins of priests, princes, and people are intertwined into such a rope of sin that hardly can we search into the sin of one class without laying bare the sins of another class. Thus, in speaking to the ancient people, Ezekiel accuses all classes in one prayer, saying :

“Her priests have despised My law and defiled My sanctuaries ; they have put no difference between holy and profane. . . .

“Her princes in the midst of her are like wolves ravening the prey to shed blood and to destroy souls and to run after gain through covetousness.

"The people of the land oppress the stranger by calumny without judgement." (Ezek. xxii, 26, 27, 29.)

So far the prophet. Would that these things belonged only to those days and did not give us a picture of our own days ! When we speak of the ill-living of the priests, would that we could deny that the main occasion and greatest facility and authority has been given by princes and people !

But let us curb our words until a fitting time ; and only open the flood-gates of our common tears.

Let us therefore come back to those whom we undertook to admonish ; and especially those bishops who have come here with mandates from their princes. We therefore admonish them that they serve their princes with all loyalty and zeal ; but as becomes bishops. They must serve them as the servants of God and not as servants of men. The Apostle says, "Be not the servants of men." (1 Cor. vii, 22.) Let them first serve the one King Christ to whom God the Father has given all power ; and then on His account let them serve all and especially princes : "honour to whom honour is due, and tribute to whom tribute". (1 Cor. vii, 22.) We exhort them to serve their princes unto honour ; as the very words of their commissions declare, in which nothing is set forth that is not unto honour and to the common good. In a word, let them so serve that their first care will be for the honour of God and the profit of this Council which has been summoned for the common good. All those who must give their judgement here before God, His angels, and the whole Church, we exhort that they speak without human respect ; but still more that we speak without hatred of anyone, even should he represent one of our opponents or private or public enemies.

Finally, we desire and exhort in the Lord that we keep ourselves from all strife amongst ourselves. It is this which grieves and repels the Holy Spirit, without whom we can do naught to the good of peace or the Church. "For whereas", says the Apostle, "there are among you contentions, are you not men and walk you not as men ?" (1 Cor. iii, 3.)* Now when he calls them men, he means devoid of the Spirit of God.

* Vulg. : ". . . are you not carnal", etc.

In everything pertaining to the reformation of the Church, for which purpose we have forgathered, we should imitate Him who first made it. Of His entrance on the work the prophet says in the person of God, "Behold My Servant, whom I have chosen: My beloved in whom My soul delights. I have given My Spirit unto Him. He will deliver judgement to the Gentiles. He shall not strive nor cry aloud. The bruised reed He shall not break; the smoking flax He shall not quench."

This spirit of peace, of charity, of meekness we should show towards all and in the sight of all; but especially in this sacred Council to which we have come that by the grace of this Spirit an end may be put to the disputes that for so long have rent the Church.

For this reason we who are here in the rôle of peace-makers must especially beware of giving any cause for disputes. By one way alone shall we both avoid these and all other hindrances to peace, and reach the desired port of peace. In prayers springing from a humble and repentant heart we must call upon the Spirit of Christ, who is "our peace" (Eph. ii, 14), that He may preside at this Council, that He may shed His light on our hearts, and that, in all things, He may rule and guide us to His own honour and the Church's true profit. To such as these He Himself says: "Whilst thou wert speaking, I was with thee." (Is. lxxv, 24.)

Therefore, that we may turn with all our heart to these prayers, we exhort you in the Lord, with all charity, "that with one mind and one mouth we may glorify God the Father in Christ Jesus" (Rom. xv, 6), who is God blessed for ever. AMEN.

ABBOT CHAPMAN'S LETTERS

The Spiritual Letters of Dom John Chapman, O.S.B. Edited by Dom Roger Hudleston, O.S.B. Second edition. (Sheed and Ward. 7s. 6d.)

TWO distinguished abbots of the Benedictine Order have been privileged recently to have their spiritual letters posthumously published. The two prelates thus surviving themselves are Abbot Marmion of Maredsous and Abbot Chapman of Downside. Dom R. Thibaut, O.S.B., has given us the epistolary output of his well-beloved hero, the Irish monk who for many years ruled the Belgian Abbey of Maredsous. Dom Roger Hudleston, O.S.B., has enriched Catholic literature with the spiritual letters of Dom John Chapman, fourth Abbot of Downside. The subject of this article is the second edition of the latter book, revised and enlarged. The two monastic editors, who in their persons show forth one of the most precious qualities of the Benedictine monk—loyalty to the head of the abbey not only in life but even after death—carry out their respective tasks on dissimilar lines. Dom Thibaut entitles his volume *Union With God*; the book is a series of chapters very much like any other spiritual work and the headings of the chapters are all the Christian virtues in succession. Dom Thibaut gathers, from the letters of the dead Abbot, passages and phrases anent the virtue that entitles the chapter. Letters are not given in full, but they are made the quarry from which materials are taken for the construction of a spiritual book.

Very different is the method of Dom Roger Hudleston of Downside; he publishes the letters as he finds them, with the vaguest of classification: "Letters to Lay-folk", "Letters to Religious", "Letters to a Jesuit", "A Supplement of Letters"—such are the headings of the Downside volume. It goes without saying that Dom Hudleston's policy, if less cautious, adds immensely to the interest of the epistolary correspondence of the deceased Abbot. No one can take up the book without being carried away by the vividness of thought and senti-

ment revealed by these personal documents. It would be unreasonable to ask for the publication of the letters of the Abbot's correspondents in order to be able to judge adequately the full bearing of Dom Chapman's answers. No volume of spiritual letters could thus present the two sides, as unquestionably much matter of conscience is contained in the writings that provoked the answers. The impression is that a more complete self-portraiture could not have been given to the world than these letters from the pen of the distinguished scholar who now lies buried under the shadow of the Abbey church of Downside. Truly the letters are Abbot Chapman all over; an intensely eager nature, an extremely independent mind, a heart as simple as that of a child, an indefatigable learner in the school of God and one that is happy to confess that he is learning daily and that he abandons willingly opinions to which at one time he had clung tenaciously. Moreover, with all that badinage which was one of the Abbot's charms in life, he was profoundly orthodox, nay, even gravely so. No one could read without being touched by this passage which appears under the heading "Letters to a Jesuit":

Theology, as we know it, has been formed by the great Mystics—especially by St. Augustine and St. Thomas. Plenty of other great theologians—especially St. Gregory and St. Bernard, even down to Suarez—would not have had such insight without mystic superknowledge. But there is another side. If I should study all the publications of the Rationalist press, with a view to refuting them, and with a proper amount of prayer and humility, I should probably get nothing but good. But if I read them carelessly, for amusement; or if I read them seriously, with the intention of getting help from them towards a theory of life, I suppose I should soon cease to be a Christian. It is only when one has a safe, clear position of one's own, that one can afford to study the positions of others. That is why, if you *do* want to read modern anti-Christian Philosophy, you are bound *first* to know where you stand, by what standard you can judge them. It is very dangerous to hold the Catholic Faith as a matter of "the Religious Consciousness". It is a matter of Truth or Falsehood. That is why I, for my part, should be horribly afraid of reading non-Christian philosophy, or science, or Biblical criticism, or anything of the kind—if I had not a definite and *reasoned* position to rest upon.

You may feel yourself more safe, and I do not doubt that this is the case, and that God has given you great graces, to which I do not pretend. But I must humbly suggest, whether it would not be best to be on the safe side ; to wait for a philosophy until you have rationalized your religion ? Not, anyhow, to try and explain your religion by an outsider's philosophy ; which is to make philosophy the all-in-all, and religion its handmaid. Catholicism claims that religion is all, and that theology embraces the whole of life. (Pp. 236, 237.)

Beyond all doubt the Abbot had a keen sense of orthodoxy and his long letter to the young Jesuit is a revelation of his own mental processes : "I always *try* to be *orthodox*, first of all. For Truth is above Charity, and above everything paramount " (p. 212). He admits that St. Thomas Aquinas helped him out of the uncertainties of Hegelianism :

I think I was largely attracted to Hegel because he is Christian. Kant is the typical Protestant ; Hegel is nearly a Catholic. But his silly little SYSTEM repelled me. It was just then that I began to have a little religion. I began to find the answer in Revelation, and ever since then I have lost my interest in philosophy, except as an intellectual exercise, or a means of refuting error. I suppose I had been a Catholic about eight or ten years when I had satisfactorily worked out a theory of religion and the world for myself—a working theory, which had been, till then, implicit, but not thought out. Much earlier, in beginning my Theology (I did no Philosophy, but read St. Thomas's *Summa* with commentaries, and occasionally got some help from Father Columba Marmion, the present Abbot of Maredsous), I had been helped enormously by the first part of St. Thomas. I had never before known what God is. I had realized His Transcendence as emptiness, not as fulness. (Pp. 210, 211.)

The temptation to quote further extracts is very great ; no one, I am sure, could read the letters which Dom Hudleston has published without admiring the brilliant Catholicism of a mind that by trend and education was so likely to be side-tracked. To the correspondent already referred to he writes :

Especially, however, *think things out*, with the help of sound, orthodox theology. But don't go to anything but the best, the

soundest ; the Doctors, the Councils, the consent of the School. Only don't read any books you don't like ; it is always bad for the soul to read uninteresting spirituality. (P. 235.)

Like every other director of souls he is up against that particularly modern form of discouragement which comes from the absence of experience ; the spiritual Father keeps repeating to his "*philothet*" : "It is all right ! You are in a perfectly normal state. Don't worry" (p. 140). The reality of the spiritual life in the total absence of the experimental element has made Abbot Chapman an enthusiastic disciple of St. John of the Cross. The Abbot thinks that temptation against faith is the special form of trial common at the present day ; in the eighteenth century, he says, the commonest result of the "Night of the Spirit" was "the feeling of being hated by God, and of being doomed to Hell" (p. 141). He exhorts a religious to "hug" her spiritual dryness : "The more you are stripped of all satisfaction and self-satisfaction, the more pleasing you are to our Blessed Lord" (p. 160). So we are not surprised to find under the Abbot's pen this humble admission : "I always used to abuse St. John of the Cross. Now I find him the one author who knows his own mind. He is so clear and accurate" (p. 116). The dogmatic orthodoxy of the late Abbot of Downside stands in a beautiful light in the self-revelations that constitute the letters. His insistence that souls must hope against hope seems to betray periods of soul-anguish in his own person which must have given great maturity to his spiritual life.

Since the letters have come to light a controversy has arisen concerning Abbot Chapman's correctness in stating the problem of contemplation. We have, of course, nothing but incidental phrases from which to arrive at conclusions. It would seem, however, that, like so many others, he instinctively follows the doctrine of the primacy of charity, not the doctrine of the primacy of faith.

One of the corner-stones of Catholic spirituality is this : charity is the greatest of all virtues ; charity is greater than faith and hope ; the act of charity therefore,

which according to St. Thomas is *dilectio*, far surpasses in excellency the acts of faith and hope. The root reason for this is that charity is the same on earth and in heaven, whilst faith and hope are essentially transitory. So it ought to be admitted without any contradiction that the Christian soul is at its highest when it loves in charity and that all the other spiritual acts, even the theological acts of faith and hope, in all their manifestations remain far behind that supreme act of the Christian soul, *dilectio Dei*. It is necessary therefore to say that in our spiritual life acts of knowledge of any kind are inferior to acts of the will transformed by charity : in other words, cognitive acts and volitive acts do not move *pari passu*. This is possible on the supposition only that the Holy Ghost Himself is the cause of our acts of charity. Faith and hope do not cause charity, but they are mere dispositions towards charity ; the Holy Ghost Himself causes charity. It is therefore possible for an act of love to be far in excess of the knowledge that is in man in the supernatural order. It is only in heaven, when the intellect is given Beatific Vision, that there will be perfect proportion between the cognitive and the volitive in man.

With a variety of turns of phrase and perhaps without ever having reasoned it out clearly himself, Abbot Chapman puts forth this great psychological law of the supernatural order. There is no doubt about his giving the preference to the volitive, to the acts of the will ; but in this he is merely a good Thomist, not to say a good Catholic. For—although St. Thomas is well known for fighting for the primacy of the intellect over the will in the natural order—in the supernatural order, in the sphere of the theological virtues, he reverses this policy and says most emphatically that the will in charity is far superior to the intellect illumined by faith and by the gifts of the Holy Ghost in this life. For a first statement of this problem the reader may go to *Secunda Secundae*, Quaestio XXIII, Art. 6, not omitting to read the Commentary of Cajetan on the same article.

I do not think I have gone beyond my task in recalling these theological principles. It is certain that spiritual writers have every right to give the preference to the acts

of the will in the matter of prayer, and Dom Chapman seems to have made ample use of this right. To make acts of love is not contemplation, because, by its very name, contemplation is the exercise of our intellect through faith. Acts of love are *dilectio*, which, says Aquinas, is the principal office of charity; *contemplatio* may be called the ripe fruit of faith. It is, of course, essentially cognitive, but it would never be sufficient to produce directly that *dilectio* of charity which the Holy Ghost alone can produce in the soul.

It would seem as if Abbot Chapman had created the impression of despising the cognitive element in prayer. I do not think the accusation is justified; he certainly taught the superiority and the relative independence of the act of love from the act of intellection; but in this he is quite orthodox. I may be permitted to quote *in extenso* one of the offending passages, were it only to give an idea of the Abbot's way with souls.

I have come to the conclusion that one can remain united to God even when one goes to sleep in time of prayer. Don't laugh! I say this, because I think I told you that, when one feels one is going to sleep, it is good to try and *think* some good thoughts, or even reason out something, in order to keep awake. If I said so, I was wrong. I see that it simply stops prayer dead; so that thinking is more disastrous than sleep! I mean, quite seriously, that it is best to remain united to God's Will (making any acts to fill up the time, that come of themselves, or none at all if none come) and not to mind if one's internal attitude is very much that of *trying* to go to sleep. But of course one can do one's best to keep off actual sleep by fidgeting, or changing one's position, and so forth. (P. 117.)

One revered writer on spiritual matters, His Grace Archbishop Goodier, has been much upset by this paragraph, and he gives vent to his alarm in two numbers of *The Month*, June and November 1935. The Archbishop is evidently under the impression that the Abbot belittles thinking and reasoning in the process of prayer: "Among other statements made by the Abbot I was much upset by one: 'Thinking (in prayer) is more disastrous than sleep.'"* The frequent reiteration of that same passage

* *The Month*, November 1935, p. 351.

in the Archbishop's October letter leaves no doubt that he gives to the Abbot's phrase an axiomatic value as if the latter had meant to say something universally valid. So the Archbishop protests vehemently: "In all the spiritual literature in the Church's history, what other spiritual writer has ever written anything like this: 'Of course one can do one's best to keep off sleep by fidgeting'? We must not keep it off by 'thinking', for 'thinking is more disastrous than sleep'; but we may keep it off by 'fidgeting'" (p. 351).

A less sombre interpretation of the Abbot's letter is certainly possible. Does he not mean something that is immensely remote from an axiomatic utterance when he says in this letter that thought is more disastrous than sleep? The adjective "disastrous" here need not shake the foundations of the spiritual world. What does it imply? That the effort of thinking when the mind is heavy with sleep produces more rapidly that very state one tries to avoid, blankness of mind. Who has not had such experience hundreds of times? When we try to go to sleep we never succeed, as everybody knows; so likewise very often when we try to think our minds flounder more than ever. A bodily movement, a "fidgeting", will certainly be more efficacious to rouse our tired senses than any mental effort.

My first impression on reading this letter was that it states exactly the sort of thing that is told to novices when they ask their Master how to fight sleepfulness in their morning meditation. Reading the passage again, after the alarming interpretation given to it by one who is a great master in the spiritual life, I cannot help wondering at the diversity of interpretation of which most common sayings may be patient. Abbot Chapman was certainly not one to deny the value, nay, even the necessity, of mental work in the evolution of interior life: "If you don't meditate, you get *nothing*! for Rosary and Litanies don't give you much . . . I suppose you are aware that even the greatest contemplatives *must meditate*" (p. 235). Such words, written to a young Jesuit, make it evident that there is no contempt for the intellectual side of spirituality in Abbot Chapman's theories. On the other

hand, he certainly knew that meditation alone, or, if we like, the intellectual side of interior life, must soon remain behind and that charity in all its forms will expand the soul under the direct influence of the Holy Ghost.

✠ ANSCAR VONIER,
ABBOT OF BUCKFAST.

SOME RECENT BOOKS

FREEDOM AND THE SPIRIT. By Nicolas Berdyaev. Translated by Oliver Fielding Clarke. (Geoffrey Bles. 12s. 6d.)

THIS is a great book rich in profound and comprehensive insights. Read with a cautious discrimination by those sufficiently acquainted with the fundamentals of Catholic philosophy, it should provide an invaluable and unique stimulus and enrichment of the intellectual and spiritual life. But only when read under these conditions. For the metaphysical and theological doctrine here expressed or implied is erroneous in several most fundamental respects. Professor Berdyaev makes too great a concession to that modern exaltation of energy or life at the expense of form which I have ventured to christen "energeticism". Unable to conceive of an energy which is not a process, a motion, a becoming, he rejects the category of substance and even maintains that "the conception of God as *actus purus* [pure act] transforms God into a lifeless object". On the contrary the conception of an "unmoving energy" which the doctrine implies is precisely that synthesis of rest and activity in Perfect Being for which Berdyaev himself argues. Nor is the category of substance opposed to that of energy, but only to that of an energy unfixd by form. This initial misconception leads Berdyaev to postulate as the ultimate reality a chaotic potentiality, an aboriginal freedom, "a primal void of divine nothingness", "initial, irrational and mysterious", which "conceals within itself the possibility

both of evil and good" and in which "God and creation, God and man disappear and even the very antithesis between them vanishes". Such a being is clearly not God. Indeed Berdyaev, who in all this is following what he understands, probably with truth, to be the teaching of Eckhardt, concludes that "the distinction between the Creator and creation is eliminated altogether in the Divine nothingness which is no longer God". God exists only as Creator in an eternal correlation with creation.

Creation is thus brought into the Absolute, not simply in its idea, but somehow actually as a coeternal birth from the absolute void with God Himself. Man therefore is the eternal counterpart of God. God needs man. And the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity is man not only by the assumption of a human nature but eternally as the Eternal Son. Protest as he will, and struggle against it as he will—and Berdyaev, being profoundly religious, does this throughout the book—he cannot logically escape a species of pantheism. His doctrine seems much the same as that of the theistic Vedantist Ramanuja, who held that the universe was eternally implicit in Brahma; and when it becomes explicit, as relatively distinct Brahma gives rise to God, Ishvara, as its counterpart. The fundamental truth of the Absolute transcendence of God, as it has been held by Judaism and Christianity, is rejected. And this surely is the fundamental doctrine of theism. To be sure the universe and the humanity of our natural experience are but projections on to a lower plane of the eternal cosmos and the eternal man. But man in his essence and the world in its essence, *actual*, not ideal, are none the less divine in their own right and part of the ultimate super-godhead. Man's deification by grace with its corresponding redemption and glorification of the universe are thus a restoration of both to the aboriginal divinity they possess on the absolute plane. Though the empirical man is deified by grace freely accepted, in the eternal Christ and the eternal Church he is Divine by nature.

The tendency of such a doctrine can, it seems to me, be only to play into the hands of those powerful forces which in one form or another deify man as in his own

right absolute. For according to Berdyaev's empirical man this natural universe owe their existence only to a supertemporal fall. But for the abuse of freedom there would be only the eternal man and his eternal world. From such a position it would not be a huge step to eliminate God altogether, declare man and the cosmos the sole products of the aboriginal process and potentiality, and their self-deification the end of that process. And a philosophy of this kind would in fact seem to be the goal towards which the dialectical materialism of Russia, as described elsewhere by Berdyaev himself, is actually tending. As he has told us, this materialism should more strictly be termed a dark spiritualism. The self-moving matter—more truly energy—of dialectical materialism is not so very different from Berdyaev's primordial energy, to which, rather than to the fiat of God, man and the world, as well as God Himself, owe their being. "In Christian thought matter predominates over form" (p. 333). But it is precisely form which constitutes an energy what it is. It is in virtue of its form that a spirit differs from a corporeal substance. A matter which predominates over and so determines form is hard to distinguish in the last analysis from the autodynamic matter whose free self-evolution is bringing about the Bolshevik absolute, the self-deified human society.

Spiritually Berdyaev is at the opposite pole to Russian Communism. But his energeticist and implicitly pantheist metaphysic meets it half-way. If he would but accept the primacy of form, of the idea, he would achieve an adequate intellectual statement of his profoundest insights and the Platonism to which he appeals. The *ideal* essence of man and the world eternal in the Divine Word would provide the basis for that deification of man by grace which is rightly so dear to him. But the transcendence of the sole Absolute and eternal being and the comparative nothingness of the creature which is implicit in every act of religious worship would be safeguarded against all danger of a pantheistic deification of the creature as such. "The distinction between the Creator and creation" is "the deepest that exists". If not, the Creator is not truly God and the way is open for

the enthronement of man in His place. Further points might be noticed on which Berdyaev's doctrine is unacceptable, for example the notion that the division of the sexes is the result of sin. And his treatment of Catholic philosophy and theology is often very unfair. If the Papacy has too often compromised with Caesar to the detriment of religion, the Orthodox Church became his slave. Professor Berdyaev might do well to ponder the remarks on this topic made by his compatriot Solovyev in the opening chapters of his *Russie et l'Eglise Universelle*. And I should like to hear what Bl. Edmund Campion would have said to his remark that "Protestantism . . . always defended religious freedom"—notably at Tyburn. Even Macaulay knew better.

And yet this book is animated from first to last by such a profound spirit of religion—and such a powerful conviction of the Divine Spirit at work in creation and human history through the free co-operation of man to restore and deify mankind, of the value of spiritual freedom, of the world and the historic process as the symbol because the reflection of an interior reality, spiritual, eternal, and divine—that I feel almost ashamed of the emphasis I have laid upon the errors of conceptual statement, grave as they are. With that which Professor Berdyaev is seeking to say I find myself in the deepest and most enthusiastic agreement. But I am the more sorry that for want of an adequate metaphysic he has so often failed to say it. What he has to tell us here of the symbolic nature of our natural experience, of the inner meaning of art, and of the invisible Church should move the sensitive reader to the depths of his soul. Professor Berdyaev opens up vast, if necessarily dim, perspectives of a cosmology and an anthropology, a doctrine of man and the world—I might add an ecclesiology, a doctrine of the Church—implicit in Christianity, but as yet but little developed. And his attack upon the false ecclesiasticism which mistakes the means for the end and gives in practice an absolute value to the external, juridical, and institutional embodiments of absolute Truth, though marred by a tendency to contrast Catholics with the worst orthodox offenders in this respect—if they are it is

because the East has withdrawn religion too completely from contact with the world—is as necessary as it is vigorous and convincing.

Throughout the book the author is pleading for a greater sanctification of human creative work as contrasted with ascetic self-purification from sin, as being God's instrument for the transfiguration of mankind and the world in Himself. It is a most urgent problem and a most inspiring summons that are here brought before us. But it is the more lamentable that the background of Berdyaev's treatment is a radically erroneous view of the relation between the creature and God. Berdyaev's statement of his religious ideal, the deification of man with all his positive activities and modes of knowledge by, in, and for God, would have lost nothing of its appeal if the Absolute transcendence of God over the creature thus to be divinized by His grace had been clearly maintained. On the contrary the danger of substituting a humanity and a world intrinsically divine for the God whose free Love, *not need*, has given them their entire being would have been removed. As it is, the rich store of spiritual insight to be found in this book must be disentangled from the immanentism and virtual, though unintended, pantheism which are here mingled with it. To conclude where I began, for all who will distinguish its error from its truth the book is a generous wine; to others it may prove a subtle poison.

E. I. WATKIN.

FREEDOM IN THE MODERN WORLD. By Jacques Maritain. Translated by Richard O'Sullivan, K.C. (Sheed & Ward. 6s.)

THE FREEDOM OF THE INTELLECT AND OTHER CONVERSATIONS WITH THE SAGE THEONAS. By Jacques Maritain. Translated by F. J. Sheed. (Sheed & Ward. 3s. 6d.)

LIKE Professor Berdyaev, M. Maritain is concerned with freedom and with the freedom of the Christian soul under modern conditions. But he has the advantage of a solid and coherent metaphysical foundation. Though I cannot at all points subscribe to his Thomism of the strictest

observance, I cannot recall any metaphysical issue raised in this book as to which I found myself in disagreement with him. The foundation of human freedom in man's rational nature and its perfection, not as an indetermination between good and evil (an indetermination to which Professor Berdyaev would appear to ascribe an absolute value both as the beginning and end of the world process) but as a perfect and immutable conformity with the will of God, are among the points clearly brought out here. M. Maritain proceeds to show that the dignity and destiny of the human soul are incomparably superior to the values represented by the political community. "On this new level the proper good of personality as such gives man a title to precedence over the City or the State." Hence of course a right to freedom at this deeper level, and inevitable conflict with the totalitarian claims now, more than ever, put forward by the States. But may not the Liberal demand for freedom of conscience, which M. Maritain dismisses as an exaggerated valuation of freedom of choice for its own sake, have been at its best a realization, perhaps badly formulated, of the truth here stated? Personally I am convinced that this was the case and therefore that the Liberal claim for individual freedom in the sphere of the mind can be justified by the principles stated here. And I am also convinced that these principles should make us condemn the violation of conscience by the mediaeval Catholic State which M. Maritain defends, though pointing out that Catholics must in future follow a more excellent way. I cannot agree with him that the mediaeval association between the things of Caesar and of God—actually it dated from Constantine—"was, of itself, a great good". On the contrary, since the State is of its nature based on physical force it can have no place in the sphere of religion, which is essentially spiritual and therefore belongs to a sphere wholly beyond that of the State. But in fact M. Maritain, like almost all writers, identifies the State with the political society. The latter is surely a much wider term, embracing those social activities in which man's higher faculties are concerned. With it, therefore, religion is directly concerned; but with the State, whose

highest lawful competence extends only to the economic sphere, and that only in so far as compulsion may rightly be employed, religion is concerned only as it is concerned with a good system of drainage. The political society in the wide sense is fitted for *direct* sanctification by religion; the State, because it represents and must represent physical coercion, is not. This, I take it, is the point where I must beg leave to depart from M. Maritain's position.

M. Maritain would have Christians oppose at need, to the unlawful claims of a totalitarian State, an unviolent—he rightly refuses to call it passive—resistance on the lines of Mr. Gandhi's *satyagraha*. But he refuses to approve of the conscientious objector. Since, however, the nature of modern warfare and the existence of an international system of arbitration at the disposal of any States who are willing to make use of it bring almost all modern wars *clearly* within the category of the wars pronounced unjust by the moral theologians, war is precisely the sphere in which the individual conscience is most likely to come into conflict with the State. M. Maritain may reply that it is for the ruler to apply these criteria of just and unjust war. Since, however, he will always decide that his cause is just, the criteria are thus reduced to a dead letter. And in any case a man cannot take his ruler's judgment to the contrary, if he is *convinced* that a war is unjust. Since the issue depends not so much on the facts of the particular dispute as upon such general principles as the greater evil of a modern war and the possibility of arbitration, the individual is in a far better position to decide. And when nations with no interests at stake—Holland, for example, or Sweden, in the dispute between Italy and Abyssinia—decide that a particular war is unjust, their judgment is obviously more reliable than that of an interested party. It is therefore in the field of war, where, it appears, M. Maritain will not apply them, that I would have the principles and methods applied which he explains so well.

Of the many fine things in this book I like none better than the excellent reply to the view sometimes expressed, and still more often entertained at least half-consciously,

that the God of Christian faith is an Almighty Tyrant. M. Maritain shows that the exact contrary is the truth—that God's causality and rule establish and constitute the freedom of man. I wish I had space to quote his words, which will be found on pp. 93, 94. I can but call special attention to them.

The popular reprint of *Theonas* is very welcome. These essays bring home the actualness of a philosophy whose teachings, because it is the *philosophia perennis*, are applicable to the latest problems and most modern situations. (It may well be that M. Maritain would dispute my claim to be counted among its adherents. But I feel assured that I belong to the tradition of which St. Thomas was one of the greatest exponents.) With the exception of a brilliant but difficult discussion of the Aristotelian doctrine of time in its bearings upon the mathematical time of Einstein's relativity, the essays deal from various angles with the intellectual attitude of the Catholic Thomist in its opposition to the intellectual attitude of what is often called "the modern mind". In the ardour of his reaction it seems to me that M. Maritain does not always sufficiently recognize the measure of truth to be found in the theories he condemns. For example, though it is impossible to believe in an inevitable and rectilinear progress, the mere fact that the store of human knowledge increases constitutes a progress. It is surely inconceivable that, whatever catastrophe may overtake our civilization, the record of our knowledge should be blotted out. The ignorance of the Dark Ages cannot recur. And I am not sure that in our present mood we do not require encouragement rather than the reverse. On all sides we are hearing of the desperate plight of our civilization. And I must confess that I could not have conceived that a civilized European people would have relapsed into the barbarous Jew-baiting of Nazi Germany. Nevertheless if we compare the England painted by Dickens, partly in the lifetime of men and women yet living, with the England of today, we may well think that there is more to be said for progress than M. Maritain allows.

E. I. WATKIN.

RELIGION AND THE MODERN STATE. By Christopher Dawson. (Sheed & Ward. 6s.)

THE most important and the most sinister phenomenon of our age is the rise of the totalitarian State, with its menace to freedom and religion. This book is a masterly study of the rise and character of these States and of the problem they present to the Catholic. It includes a brilliant criticism of the Marxian ideology, showing the unresolved contradiction between the historical determinism and relativism of Marx's interpretation of history and his apocalyptic exaltation of the Communist society as the kingdom of a divine humanity to be established upon the ruins of the evil societies which have preceded it. There are those who regard Mr. Dawson as an apologist of Fascism. I know of a Catholic converted from Fascism chiefly by the study of his writings—which would be hard to understand were this true. Readers of this book will see that Mr. Dawson is far from justifying the totalitarian aspect of Fascism or its violent methods. What he does uphold is the corporative society, which is another matter altogether. I do, however, feel that he identifies too closely Liberalism and *laissez-faire* capitalism. Despite their historical union, a divorce is as possible as it is desirable. Nor even is democracy the *essence* of Liberalism. The essence of Liberalism, as I understand it, is the exclusion of the State from interference with the private life and the opinions of its citizens. It is not anti-Liberal to control the way in which a man uses his property. It is anti-Liberal to refuse to allow him to protest against that control—in a peaceable manner, of course.

It may well be that, as Mr. Dawson argues in this book, we are destined to see in England a totalitarian State camouflaged under democratic, humanitarian, and Liberal form. If such a State did not tolerate the free expression of opinion by free speech, a free Press, and free public meetings, it would not be a whit more Liberal than Mussolini's Italy, or Hitler's Germany—merely more hypocritical. If it did, it would not be a true dictatorship or a totalitarian State. So long as these essential liberties are jealously preserved we have a State reason-

ably free. And in such a State the Church will be able to act freely, as in England at present. Catholics will not be faced with the alternative of leaving society to go its own way or fighting it to the death. For they, equally with their fellow citizens, will be free to spread their faith. Where, as here, these fundamental liberties survive, our best course is to support all those who from whatever motive uphold them, knowing that they provide a better basis for the spiritual and intellectual propaganda of religion than any alliance with a dictatorial State such as is now being attempted in Austria.

Mr. Dawson points out that spiritual liberty is a very different thing from political (p. 50). This of course is true, for a man can always assert his spiritual liberty against a political tyrant by martyrdom. But we know very well that the majority would not be martyrs. For one who asserted his spiritual freedom by martyrdom, a multitude would accept spiritual bondage. And who dare boast that he would not be of their number? That is to say, *for the majority* political liberty is an indispensable condition of the higher spiritual liberty. From what I have said it will be seen that there is what I might term a difference of emphasis between my own position and that expressed in this book. This, however, does not affect my appreciation of this important contribution to the most urgent contemporary problem. It is of the first importance that we should realize the true nature of the political forces which are shaping the world in which Catholics will have to live for many a long day. And no book could make us realize it more clearly. The manner and style, always lucid and noble, and at times, as in the passage on the various New Jerusalems offered for our striving, of an epigrammatic brilliance, carries the reader on from start to finish with interest unabated, and, at the conclusion, wishing the book were far longer. The frontispiece in which Mr. Eric Gill presents the totalitarian State to our imagination by its New Testament symbol the scarlet woman of the Apocalypse completes the value of Mr. Dawson's essay by this revival of the custom, obsolete too long, of clothing the abstract notion of which a book treats in a concrete image.

E. I. WATKIN.

SAINT PETER CANISIUS, S.J. By J. Brodrick, S.J. (Sheed & Ward. 15s.)

JOAN OF ARC. By Milton Waldman. (Longmans, Green & Co. 12s. 6d.)

DON JOHN OF AUSTRIA. By Margaret Yeo. (Sheed & Ward. 7s. 6d.)

DON JOHN OF AUSTRIA. By George Slocombe. (Ivor Nicholson & Watson, Ltd. 15s.)

FATHER BRODRICK must be congratulated on the fine volume on St. Peter Canisius which he has written and which Messrs. Sheed & Ward have produced with so much care. There are some well-chosen illustrations, and the book, which is 843 pages in length, is introduced by a delightful and disarming preface by the author. As a matter of personal preference it makes a much greater appeal than the same author's previous volumes on St. Robert Bellarmine. But in dealing with Canisius, Fr. Brodrick's task has been simplified by Fr. Braunsberger's volumes *Beati Petri Canisii Societatis Jesu Epistulae et Acta*, to which he makes generous acknowledgement.

Fr. Brodrick has given us a thoroughly straightforward account of the saint which is all the more valuable on account of its freedom from unnecessary digressions. The common-sense and the solid deep-based charity of St. Peter Canisius are manifest throughout and some of the incidental character sketches are attractive. The account of the Emperor Ferdinand is particularly balanced and illuminating. The references are sufficient but do not overload the page, and this new biography is essential for all college libraries and for serious students of sixteenth-century history. Fr. Brodrick has certainly provided a very fine study of Catholicism in central Europe during this period. His descriptions of the Catholics and quasi-Catholics are excellent, but his account of the mentality of the Protestant leaders is perhaps less convincing. *St. Peter Canisius* is hardly a book for the general reader, and it does not make very easy reading, but it is a contribution of real value to historical studies.

Mr. Waldman's volume is certainly most approachable. Here is a highly personal account of St. Joan, apparently rapidly conceived and certainly competently executed,

written in a quick, vigorous prose which is likely to appeal to a wide public. The earlier section of the book suffers, however, from the fact that the author appears to have little understanding of the religious background of the Middle Ages, as his references to St. Catherine of Siena indicate. The statement that St. Joan's contemporaries were accustomed to do nothing "without propitiating the saint through his image" is similarly discouraging. But it is only fair to state that these disadvantages apply principally to the first two chapters. The account given of the public life of St. Joan is sound and inspiring, and the section dealing with the trial is very remarkable. With exceptional vividness and force, Mr. Waldman describes each stage of the long ordeal. If he does not altogether understand St. Joan's position, he throws a penetrating light on Bishop Cauchon.

Mr. Slocombe's biography of Don John of Austria is of less importance, but it is popular and picturesquely written, and is balanced and, on the whole, impartial. The portrait of Philip II follows a rather old-fashioned convention, as does the description of an *auto-da-fé*, but the book is in general fair in discussing the religious struggles of the period, and most of Mr. Slocombe's conclusions would meet with general agreement. There are minor inaccuracies in the account of Thomas Stukeley and in a reference to Sir Francis Englefield, but these only concern matters of detail. Those who are interested in picturesque historical biography should certainly add Mr. Slocombe's book to their library list.

In the case of Mrs. Yeo's study of Don John of Austria, the line of approach to the subject is indicated by the verses from Chesterton's *Lepanto* which are printed on the pages preceding the table of contents. Mrs. Yeo has studied the subject with much care, and there is evidence of a detailed use of sources. Her book is written in a limpid, unmannered prose which is most attractive. The life of Don John is described persuasively and with charm. Her account will be most welcome to all those who have a general interest in historical subjects, and would make an excellent Christmas or New Year's gift. She has, perhaps, left us a too-

sunlit picture of Don John, and the last words of the note which closes her study will indicate both the delightful quality of the book and the absence of shadows in her portrait. "This Crucifix", writes Mrs. Yeo, in reference to a relic in the church of Villagarcia de Campos, "is interwoven with the whole of Don John's short, stormy, glorious tragic life, from his childhood, when it hung over his bed in Villagarcia castle to the day when he died in the ruined dovecote near Namur holding *El Cristo de sus Batallas*."

DAVID MATHEW.

PAPAL PROVISIONS : Aspects of Church history, constitutional, legal, and administrative in the later Middle Ages. By Geoffrey Barraclough. (Basil Blackwell. 10s. 6d.)

MR. BARRACLOUGH has produced a valuable and profoundly illuminating study of the question of Papal provisions. Opposite the introduction he has placed a pleasant quotation from Gilbert Foliot. *Romae scimus veritatem obscurari posse, nunquam tamen, si fuerit agnita, reprobati. Thronus ille justitia est, equitatem sedes illa judicat.* After a brief introduction dealing with the centralized Church, the author proceeds to discuss the development of provisions and the theory of reservation of benefices to the Holy See which was soon added to the theory of provisions. In dealing with the *Gravamina Ecclesie Gallicane* of 1247, the line of approach to the subject becomes clear.

Thus [Mr. Barraclough writes in this connexion] there is evident, if only tentatively, that recourse to the ancient law of the Church which was to become characteristic in a later century of Gallicism. And on the other hand there is its counterpart, the theoretical construction of a royal right to intervene and to play a legitimate part in Church affairs, which manifests the true elements of the "caesaro-papism" of the outgoing fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. But if we wish to appraise these elements correctly, it is essential to recognize that the basic motive of the protest, revealed again and again in the course of the argument, was the anger of the king and magnates at the loss of revenues which they regarded as their right.

Here we have a concise impression of the author's line of reasoning. In the third chapter he considers the value of the documentary evidence and in later sections discusses the conception of the benefice, the system of provisions regarded from a legal standpoint, and the practice and procedure which were evolved. He is careful to emphasize the specifically legalistic outlook in Church government consequent upon the revival of Roman law. In connexion with the responsibility of the Papacy for the development of this practice, Mr. Barraclough states that "the cardinal fact which we have to bear in mind is that the Papacy only intervened at the instance of the interested party". His conclusions are formulated in the twelfth chapter.

We must remember [the author states on p. 154] that it is impossible to discover any financial motive weighty enough to have influenced the papal administration of minor benefices, before the first levy of Annates by Clement V at the beginning of the fourteenth century. Similarly I find no evidence of political influences until the pontificate of Innocent IV, and this was probably only a temporary result of Innocent's individual attitude to the Church and to the problems which faced him. It is more difficult to fix the time at which the constitutional importance of papal provisions was recognized. But it is certain that Clement IV's constitution *Licet ecclesiarum* of 1265 had not the importance in this regard which is generally attributed to it.

Later he discusses the use and abuse of provisions and their subsequent development. This volume constitutes a careful, stimulating, and objective contribution to the elucidation of mediaeval Church history.

DAVID MATHEW.

A HISTORY OF THE CHURCH. By the Rev. Philip Hughes.
Vol. II. (Sheed & Ward. 15s.)

THE study of mediaeval Church history in English theological colleges was long hampered by the lack of an adequate text-book. It is the primary value of this volume that it fulfils that need. For it is characterized by the three necessary qualities: a power of compression,

a sense of period, and a familiarity with the results of recent scholarship. The volume begins with the fourth century and closes with the thirteenth. It was inevitable that intervening epochs should be treated with unequal detail. Two sections have a special value: the chapter upon the influence of St. Gregory, and the study of Eastern Catholicism. The cardinal significance of the work of St. Gregory for the development of mediaeval civilization is carefully emphasized, while the essential if obscured catholicity of Byzantium is studied in its relations to the traditions of a united Christendom. In contrast, neither the treatment of Islam nor the summary of the tendencies of mediaeval speculation can be considered adequate. The religious force behind the teaching of the Koran seems underestimated and there is the customary assertion of the superiority of Arab culture. Yet Islamic culture was by chance sporadic and by essence imitative, following with aberrations a Byzantine tradition. The chapter on the thirteenth-century achievement of the Catholic intelligence fails less through the magnitude of its subject than through the mass of recent research. Thus the passages on Latin Avicennism would need to be recast in the light of the analyses of Père de Vaux.* It is odd to still read of St. Albert as the Catholic Averroes, and the effects of the Paris condemnation of 1277 seem greatly over-estimated.

Yet much of mediaeval speculation and all the development of Islam had only an indirect bearing on Catholicism, and the major part of this volume is of a consistent level and marked by the rare union of two common qualities: sustained vitality and economy of phrase. The sober generalizations on political development and social organization are those of modern professional history. They are not intended to convey a definitely authoritative estimate, yet they provide the study of the history of the Church with a background that it sometimes lacks. Father Philip Hughes has attained considerable success in a very difficult *genre* through the refusal to pontificate and the choice of a coherent method.

GERVASE MATHEW, O.P.

* *Notes et Textes sur l'avicennisme Latin*, 1934.

THOMAS MORE. By R. W. Chambers. (Jonathan Cape. 12s. 6d.)

ST. THOMAS MORE. By the Rev. Sir John R. O'Connell. (Duckworth. 6s.)

THROUGH all the controversies that have ranged round the Reformation in England, as the publishers of Sir John O'Connell's admirable little book justly remark, only one great name stands out high above all detraction. It is indeed significant of the general esteem in which St. Thomas More is now held, as well by all men of intelligence and goodwill among his compatriots as by those who are of the household of faith throughout the world, that so few differences should be discernible at the ultimate analysis of these two volumes, the one written by an Anglican layman, the other by a Catholic priest. Differences, of course, there are; but they are such as inevitably arise from variety of treatment and temperament and therefore ultimately reconcilable—not such as, having their roots in contrary conceptions of the meaning and purpose of human life itself, grow ever deeper and wider the more closely they are approached. Sir John O'Connell, himself once a distinguished lawyer, devotes a somewhat larger proportion of his space to More's legal career and to the fifteen months of his imprisonment; while Professor Chambers is at greater pains to emphasize More's place as a writer and a statesman. But these things do not affect the harmony of their several studies.

It would be difficult to display more clearly More's own view of the controversies of his time, or indeed the distinctive attitude of Catholics then or now, than in the following passage, taken almost at random from Professor Chambers, and treating of More's controversial works:

Why should the Reformation have moved More to such a passion of wrath and fear? . . . Like Milton, he believed that "it is not impossible that Truth may have more shapes than one". During his imprisonment he loved to recall how, although two Fathers of the Church had of old taken different views, yet now "they be both twain holy saints in Heaven". He repeats a dozen times or more that he condemns the conscience of no other man.

It is precisely More's tolerance that makes him, on true Utopian principles, intolerant of the Reformation. . . . More wished that the Bible should be translated into English . . . for "a commodity ought not to be kept back for the harm that may come of it". So far More goes with the Reformers. . . . He honours the scholarship of an Erasmus, poring over the Greek Testament to get the meaning of every word, till he sees Christ preaching, healing, and dying before his eyes. But More equally honours the devotion of some illiterate old woman, bowed in silent adoration at the foot of a crucifix. And when the Reformers would denounce the old woman as an idolator, and smash the crucifix before her eyes, then More stands up in wrath. Dante, skilled in all the learning of his age, when he has reached at last the Heaven of light beyond all space and is to enjoy the Beatific Vision, compares himself to some pilgrim of Croatia, in silence before the Veronica ; just so, More, with all his learning, respects the devotion of the humble and ignorant.

Nor would it be easy to better the verdict which, after carefully reviewing the evidence, Professor Chambers gives in respect of the stale scandal of More's supposed "persecution" of heretics.

Those who have given currency to the myth of More's "enormities" have shown that they possess neither the perspicacity of Mr. Justice Stareleigh (who ruled that hearsay evidence is no evidence), nor the legal acumen of Mr. Weller senior (who understood the value of an "alleybi").

In either book is manifested the extraordinary consistency of More's thought from first to last. Loyalty and liberty were alike very dear to him. For his part, he would meddle with no man's conscience. In all that could be lawfully commanded he would obey his Prince. But neither in youth nor age would he do that which conscience forbade. "Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's." Yes ; most readily, even though, as in taking the oath of fidelity to the issue of Henry and Ann Boleyn, it was utterly distasteful—since Parliament could lawfully alter the succession to the throne. But if Caesar should claim to lay hands on that which is God's ? Then for St. Thomas More there could be but one answer. He must die, as he had lived, "the King's good servant, but God's first".

Today in several parts of what we have almost forgotten to call Christendom the same claim is made; and Catholics are not the only, though still the chief, victims of the all-devouring State. Perhaps that is why, now more than at any time these many years, the love and veneration of Christians, men and women, is directed especially towards those two great Englishmen, More and Fisher, whom the Church has within the last twelve months raised to her altars.

HUGH LAW.

THE HISTORY OF THE ANGLO-SAXONS. By R. H. Hodgkin.
(Oxford University Press. Two vols. 30s.)

For many reasons a new history of Anglo-Saxon society has long been due. The Anglo-Saxons received a great deal of laudatory attention in the last century, in the heyday of the Teutonic school. Later work has widened and deepened our knowledge, and archaeology in particular has brought many new things to light. The Roman background, virtually unknown a lifetime ago, can now be clearly sketched. Mr. R. H. Hodgkin, Queen's College, Oxford, deserves the warm thanks of all students of England's past for the two volumes in which he tells the story down to its great turning-point in the victorious reign of Alfred the Great. Two further volumes will bring the story down to 1066. The Oxford Press has surpassed its own high standards of book-production. Bound in blue buckram, with coloured plates of Anglo-Saxon jewellery, with each chapter decorated with line reproductions of coins and stone monuments, and with many photographic plates, these volumes stand by themselves as the best account of the first formative centuries of English history.

Mr. Hodgkin has three great divisions of his subject matter, the origin of the English, their conversion, and their struggle to retain their home against the pagan Danish marauders. On the first subject, he makes skilful use of new finds in Scandinavia and North Germany to assess the degree and form of penetration which preceded the large-scale settlement and fighting. The Jutes appear in his pages as pre-eminently traders, with high

standards of taste and a wide range of commercial intercourse. In general, Mr. Hodgkin seeks to blend the conclusions of the older, invasion school of historians with those of Mr. Leeds and the archaeologists who have found early Saxon cemeteries round the upper Thames dating back to the last age of Roman Britain. No finality has yet been reached, nor perhaps will it ever be, on these earliest questions. Mr. Hodgkin is extremely illuminating on two sides of Anglo-Saxon religion which do not often receive full treatment. The extraordinary devotion and thoroughness with which the Anglo-Saxons threw themselves into the practice of Catholic Christianity between 650 and 850 is something quite exceptional in the history of Europe for sustained performance. Mr. Hodgkin pays it unstinting tribute, but he also, using the old medical charm books, takes a close look at the superstition and dark underworld of pagan practices which survived unexorcized till far beyond the end of his period. If he disposes of the conjectures that the conversion was easy and superficial, he also explains amid what rank growths the new fruit had to blossom. His work concludes with an appreciation of Alfred the Great in the wide range of his intellectual as well as of his practical statesmanship. Asser, he well observes, was not altogether the right man to be our chief source of knowledge of a fighting king.

There are some curious defects and omissions in the index, e.g. the reader will turn up "burials" and find nothing. These things would not matter in most books, but they are a blemish on a standard work.

DOUGLAS WOODRUFF.

